

NEGOTIATIONS AND CURRICULUM-INSTRUCTION COMPONENTS

A Dissertation
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Bonnie Jones McCrady

December 1976

NEGOTIATIONS AND CURRICULUM-INSTRUCTION COMPONENTS

by

Bonnie Jones McCrady

Approved by Committee:

Dr. Prudence Dyer
Chairperson

Dr. Marjorie Prentice

Dr. Everett E. Hadley

Dr. Richard Lampshire

Dr. Stuart C. Tiedeman

Dr. Earle L. Canfield
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

NEGOTIATIONS AND CURRICULUM-INSTRUCTION COMPONENTS

An abstract of a Dissertation by
Bonnie Jones McCrady
December 1976
Drake University
Advisor: Dr. Prudence Dyer

The problem. The problem of this study was to determine the frequency with which curriculum and instruction-related concerns are evident in collective negotiations in Iowa and how important these concerns are as perceived by the educational leadership. The sources of data were the statements or points of view expressed by persons in positions of leadership and an analysis of actual practice.

Procedures. The study population was composed of the public school districts (K-12) in the state of Iowa that elected to negotiate contracts for the first time under the Public Employment Relations Act of 1974. To obtain points of view of leadership, data were collected from two persons who held leadership positions in each of the sample school districts: (1) the person who was designated as the staff member who is most expert in curricular matters; and (2) the person who was the elected president of the local teacher organization. To obtain the points of view of college and university leadership, data were collected from a random sample (nation-wide) of professors expert in curricular matters. The negotiated contract from each of the selected sample districts was analyzed to obtain data on actual practice. The instrument consisted of thirty-four identified curriculum-instruction components. Each component was rated by each person in each leadership group in terms of its perceived importance in negotiations. The instrument served as the criteria for analysis of the contracts. For the four groups of data, frequency distributions were calculated for each of the identified curriculum-instruction components. A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not there were any significant differences (alpha level .05) between the means across the three leadership groups on the ratings of each component. The least-significant difference test was used for the significant F value.

Findings. The findings related to contract analysis show that (1) twenty-six of the components appeared in the selected sample contracts as either Primary or Secondary Importance or both; (2) eight of the components did not appear in any of the contracts analyzed; (3) four of the components appeared exclusively as Primary Importance;

(4) nine of the components had ratings in both Primary and Secondary Importance categories since they appeared in at least one contract as either Primary or Secondary Importance; and (5) thirteen of the components appeared exclusively as Secondary Importance. The findings related to the points of view of leadership are that (1) each leadership group rated each of the identified curriculum-instruction components as important in negotiations; (2) there was general agreement on the relative importance of nineteen of the thirty-four components; and (3) statistically significant differences were found between the means across the three leadership groups in the ratings of fifteen of the thirty-four components.

Conclusions. The results of the contract analysis indicated that (1) curriculum-instruction components have been negotiated and are of contractual concern; and (2) the negotiated components represent more concern with process related curriculum-instruction components than with substance related curriculum-instruction components. The results of the leadership ratings indicated that (1) each identified curriculum-instruction component was perceived as important in negotiations by each leadership group; and (2) there is a discrepancy between the perceived importance of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items and the identified curriculum-instruction components actually negotiated in the contracts.

Recommendations. A follow-up study could be undertaken in three of four years to analyze contracts to determine whether or not more or fewer of the identified curriculum-instruction components are negotiated in the contracts. Other investigations might be undertaken to increase the understanding of the issue of negotiations and curricular matters.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	x
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
THE NEED FOR THE STUDY	4
DEFINITIONS	9
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	12
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	13
Collective Negotiations in Education	15
Movement of Teacher Organizations	16
Causal Factors	22
Summary	25
PUBLIC POLICY CONTEXT	27
Summary	35
LEGAL BASIS OF NEGOTIATIONS	35
Summary	45
BARGAINING STRATEGIES	45
Summary	51
SCOPE OF NEGOTIATIONS	51
Points of View Concerning Curriculum and Instruction-Related Items in Negotiations	52
Summary	62

Chapter	Page
CONTRACT ANALYSIS RESEARCH	63
Summary	72
SUMMARY	73
3. METHODOLOGY	75
SAMPLING PROCEDURES	75
INSTRUMENT	78
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	82
SUMMARY	85
4. PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS	87
PRESENTATION OF DATA	88
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	138
SUMMARY	146
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, OBSERVATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	148
SUMMARY	148
CONCLUSIONS	151
OBSERVATIONS	153
RECOMMENDATIONS	157
BIBLIOGRAPHY	159
APPENDICES	
A. INITIAL CONTACT LETTER SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS .	168
B. INITIAL CONTACT LETTER SENT TO ELECTED PRESIDENTS OF TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS	170
C. INITIAL CONTACT LETTER SENT TO CURRICULUM PROFESSORS	172

D.	FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO EACH EDUCATIONAL LEADER	174
E.	RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	176

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Size and Number of Districts in Sample	76
2. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Academic Freedom	89
3. Academic Freedom: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	90
4. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Advanced Study Credit for Teachers	91
5. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Aims of Schools	92
6. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Audio-Visual Materials	93
7. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Citizenship Training .	94
8. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Class Interruptions . .	95
9. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Class Size	96
10. Class Size: Differences Between Means of Pairs of Groups	97
11. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Course Content	98
12. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Curriculum Change Procedures	99
13. Curriculum Change Procedures: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	100
14. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Curriculum Committees	101

Table	Page
15. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Curriculum Guides . . .	102
16. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Equipment and Supplies Availability	103
17. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Facilities Available for Instruction	104
18. Facilities Available for Instruction: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	105
19. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Faculty Meetings . . .	106
20. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Faculty Planning Groups	107
21. Faculty Planning Groups: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	108
22. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Grouping of Learners	109
23. Grouping of Learners: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	110
24. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Instructional Materials	111
25. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Material Centers . . .	112
26. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Methodology	113
27. Methodology: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	114
28. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Parent Conferences . .	115

Table

Page

29.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Professional Meeting Released Time	116
30.	Professional Meeting Released Time: Differ- ences Between Means for Pairs of Groups . . .	117
31.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Program Development Procedures	118
32.	Program Development Procedures: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	119
33.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Pupil-Teacher Ratio .	120
34.	Pupil-Teacher Ratio: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	121
35.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work	122
36.	Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	123
37.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Resource Persons from Outside the School	124
38.	Resource Persons from Outside the School: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	125
39.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Sabbatical Leave . . .	126
40.	Sabbatical Leave: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	127
41.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for School-Community Relationships	128
42.	ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for School Organization .	129

Table	Page
43. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum	130
44. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Teacher Participation in Decision-Making	131
45. Teacher Participation in Decision-Making: Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	132
46. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Teacher's Responsi- bilities in Classroom Activities	133
47. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Teacher Responsibil- ity for Professional Growth	134
48. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Textbook (required use)	135
49. Textbook (required use): Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups	136
50. ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Textbook Selection . .	137
51. Contract Analysis Summary of Total Sample . . .	140
52. Summary of ANOVA for Rating Groups with Significant Differences	144

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Collective-Bargaining Coverage by State	40

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Collective negotiations is a mechanism for change in American education. The state legislature has set this process in motion in Iowa. Along with thirty other states across the nation, Iowa has legislation extending collective bargaining rights to public employees. The process of negotiations has taken hold in thousands of public schools and colleges in these states. In addition, two federal public employee bargaining bills were introduced in the 94th Congress. As the trend toward negotiations has gained momentum, the movement gives indication of changing from a state to a national movement.

The mechanism of negotiations has propelled educational personnel into new relationships, with new opportunities and new challenges. The power inherent in negotiations is a means for transforming education, for the better or for the worse. The effect of negotiations on the management of the schools, on the supervision of instruction, on the educational program, on curriculum and instructional issues, on the allocation of funds, and on the ways decisions are made are legitimate matters of concern. The critical factor at this point is not whether negotiations should or should not be encouraged; rather, it is important to appraise realistically the problems and issues related to negotiations.

This investigation is concerned with and limited to the area of curriculum and instruction-related concerns in negotiations. The chances for successful negotiations are greatly enhanced when all participants act on the basis of accurate and timely information rather than emotionalism and irrationality. Accurate and timely information is more than understanding one's own position on given issues. It is necessary to be aware of other points of view, factors that influence educational decision-making, legislation, economic implications, bargaining strategies, and current research regarding the major issues of negotiations. The need is critical for more knowledgeable persons at all levels of the educational enterprise to think through these issues if the problems are to be faced and the needs of students, society, and its institutions are to be met.

Through the enabling legislation of the Public Employment Relations Act of 1974 (Iowa Code, Section 20), teacher organizations are in the process of negotiating or have negotiated contracts with school boards for the 1976-77 school year. Of the 449 public school districts (K-12), approximately 275 of the local teacher organizations (affiliates of the National Education Association) have elected to bargain for the first time in Iowa.¹

¹Iowa State Education Association, "Informational Report," Communique, XXXI (February, 1976), 7.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to determine the frequency with which curriculum and instruction-related concerns are evident in collective negotiations in Iowa and how important these concerns are as perceived by the educational leadership.

The two major sources of information to determine the extent of concern are (1) the statements or points of view expressed by persons in positions of leadership; and (2) an analysis of actual practice.

The study is designed to seek answers to these questions:

1. With what frequency do curriculum and instruction-related components appear as items in selected contracts negotiated by the affiliates of the National Education Association (NEA) in the state of Iowa?
2. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the curriculum and instruction-related components as negotiable items by the curriculum specialists of the selected public school districts?
3. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the curriculum and instruction-related components as negotiable items by the elected presidents of the local NEA affiliates?
4. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation

of the curriculum and instruction-related components as negotiable items by the college and university professors expert in curriculum matters.

5. What are the differences or similarities in ratings of the curriculum and instruction-related components as indicated by the leadership ratings of the elected presidents of the local NEA affiliates, the public school curriculum specialists, and the college and university professors expert in curriculum matters?

THE NEED FOR THE STUDY

This study is needed to gain information into the present status of curriculum and instruction-related concerns in collective negotiations. The problem of curriculum development and instructional improvement is a continuing challenge in American education. Taba suggested that curriculum development is a vital problem that concerns teachers, administrators, school boards, and citizens alike. She stated

One need not be a prophet to recognize that the forces in education today have the makings either of a great resurgence in curriculum development or of a grand retrogression, depending on the kind of thinking that has the most weight in their shaping.¹

¹Hilda Taba, Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962), p. 1.

Doll noted the several trends in the evolution of curriculum and pointed out the relatively recent influence of the teachers' organizations in curriculum-making.¹ The major source of ideas for curricular change has been the college or university. College and university professors do not constitute a unitary block of opinion on curricular questions. They have been a source of much-needed diversity and expertise. The professional organizations of college and university professors may represent a body of opinion and can be extremely influential.

The term "curriculum" has been defined in a variety of ways. It has been defined as all the experiences a learner has under the guidance of the school.² Curriculum can be defined as

A sequence of potential experiences...set up in the school for the purpose of disciplining children and youth in group ways of thinking and acting.³

The curriculum can be viewed as the school's attempt

¹Ronald C. Doll, Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Process (2d ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970), pp. 14-15.

²Nolan C. Kerney and Walter W. Cook, "Curriculum," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: Macmillan Company, 1960), p. 358.

³B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores, Fundamentals of Curriculum Development (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1957), p. 3.

to answer the question of what educational experiences are best for the welfare of the individual learner and for the society of which he is a member.¹ Taba said "curriculum is, after all, a way of preparing young people to participate as productive members of our culture."² When curriculum is defined in these ways, curriculum and instruction cannot be regarded as separate entities.

Macdonald noted that traditionally the tendency has been to include instruction within curriculum, and teaching and learning within the instructional setting. He suggested that the concept of systems can be utilized to examine each of the terms.³

Macdonald proposed that the teaching-learning system is more aptly called the instructional system. The first level of the instructional system is bounded by a classroom with a teacher, students, materials, and social norms. It is the action context within which formal teaching and learning behaviors take place. The curriculum system is

¹Gerald B. Leighbody and Ernest F. Weinrich, "Balancing the Roles in Curriculum Decision Making," Balance in the Curriculum, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1961 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1961), pp. 162-165.

²Taba, op. cit., p. 10.

³James B. Macdonald, Theories of Instruction (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965), pp. 3-7.

the next level of the system consisting of the persons who are a part of a social system which produces plans for action. Macdonald argued that they are essentially two separate action contexts: (1) curriculum, producing plans for further action; and (2) instruction, putting plans into action. Thus:

Teaching is defined as the behavior of the teacher, learning as the change in learner behavior, instruction as the pupil-teacher interaction situation and curriculum as those planning endeavors which take place prior to instruction.¹

A useful definition for curriculum can be the following:

The curriculum is the planned interaction of pupils with instructional content, instructional resources, and instructional processes for the attainment of educational objectives.²

Instruction can be viewed as "the activities dealing directly with the teaching of pupils and with improving the quality of teaching."³ The latter two definitions of curriculum and instruction are used for the purposes of this study.

All curricula are composed of certain elements.

¹Macdonald, loc. cit.

²Department of Health Education and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics, Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 3.

³Ibid.

Taba described these elements as (1) a statement of aims and of specific objectives; (2) an indication of selection and organization of content; (3) an indication of certain patterns of learning and teaching; and (4) a program of evaluation of the outcomes.¹ Decisions about the elements of curricula need to be made on the basis of valid criteria.

Curriculum decision-making is a process by which the content and activities included in the instructional program or the techniques utilized in presenting that content are determined. An examination of curriculum decision-making indicates that there are different levels of decision-making: societal, community, governmental (both federal and state), administrative, parental, and instructional. Some basic issues of curriculum decision-making include:

1. Who should determine what is taught?
2. How shall the content be organized to be taught?
3. How shall those concerned be organized to decide what is to be taught?
4. Shall a comprehensive curriculum be provided for all children and youth?
5. What shall be regarded as general and special education?
6. How shall a balance be maintained in what is taught?
7. What subject areas deserve immediate attention?

¹Taba, loc. cit.

8. What teaching strategies shall be utilized?
9. How shall what is taught be financed?
10. How shall the subjects that are taught be evaluated?
11. What procedure shall be employed for removing from the curriculum those things which are no longer pertinent?

The establishment of collective negotiations changes the structure and the basis of decision-making in a school district. The practical effect is to grant teachers an increased amount of control over the decisions of management. The process creates a presumption in favor of compromise and accommodation which provides teachers a voice, if not control, in matters reserved exclusively to boards and administrators in the past. It also serves to augment the political and economic power of teachers.

In summary, this study deals with priority matters related to the implementation of the Public Employment Relations Act of 1974 in the public school districts (K-12) in the state of Iowa. The results should yield base line data for decision-making for the educational leadership of the state.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions will be used:

1. Arbitration: The procedure whereby the parties involved in an impasse submit their differences to a third party for a final and binding decision as provided by state law.¹
2. Curriculum: The planned interaction of pupils with instructional content, instructional resources, and instructional processes for the attainment of educational objectives. Instruction is included within curriculum and involves the activities dealing directly with the teaching of pupils and with improving the quality of teaching.
3. Curriculum decision-making: The process by which the content and activities included in the instructional program or the techniques utilized in presenting the content are determined.
4. Curriculum-instruction component: Those factors which have been judged as important elements of curriculum and instruction. These are operationally defined in the research instrument which appears in the Appendix.
5. Impasse: The failure of a public employer and the employee organization to reach agreement in the course of negotiations.²

¹Iowa, Iowa Code, Sec. 20, "Definitions," (1974).

²Ibid.

6. Mediation: The assistance by an impartial third party to reconcile an impasse between the public employer and the employee organization through interpretation, suggestion, and advice.¹
7. Negotiations: The teacher-school board procedure for establishing a contract. It is a process whereby employees as a group and their employers make offers and counteroffers in good faith on the conditions of their employment relationship for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. The process is commonly referred to in the literature as collective bargaining, collective negotiations or professional negotiations.²
8. Primary curriculum-instruction component: Those factors which have been judged to be significant elements of curriculum-instruction.
9. Secondary curriculum-instruction component: Those factors which have been judged to be less significant elements of curriculum-instruction.

¹Ibid.

²Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966), p. 2.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. The population is composed of the public school districts (K-12) in the state of Iowa that have elected to negotiate contracts for the 1976-77 school year.
2. The designated curriculum-instruction components in this study are those identified by Ziemer.¹
3. The contracts analyzed in this study are the negotiated agreements from the selected sample districts.
4. Data are to be collected from persons holding leadership positions in the selected sample districts and professors selected from the "Professors of Curriculum List."
5. The study does not attempt to judge the impact of including or excluding any of the curriculum-instruction components in individual contracts.

¹Russell H. Ziemer, "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum-Instruction Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, 1972).

NOTE: An expansion of these components appear in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature related to the issue of negotiations and curriculum and instruction-related concerns included the following areas: (1) the historical background; (2) the movement of teacher organizations toward more powerful roles in policy formulation and decision-making through collective negotiations or collective bargaining; (3) the schools viewed in the context of public policy; (4) the legal basis of negotiations; (5) bargaining strategies; (6) the various points of view regarding the scope of negotiations; and (7) research related to the major issues of negotiations with particular emphasis on curriculum and instruction-related concerns.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

One of the more dramatic recent developments in public education in the United States is the increasing effort of teachers to seek recognition and more powerful roles in policy formulation and decision-making through the medium of collective bargaining, collective negotiation, professional negotiation in local school districts. Collective bargaining is a process for resolving issues between employers and employees. Walter discussed, briefly, the development of collective bargaining in the private

sector. The National Labor Relations Act of 1935, known as the Wagner Act, and the companion legislation in 1947, commonly termed the Taft-Hartley Act, established and then confirmed the position of the Congress that the public interest was served by guaranteeing workers certain rights to collective action in pursuit of their interests as employees. This legislation applied only to interstate commerce.¹ In 1962, President Kennedy established Executive Order 10988, which required that certain employee rights be extended to those employed by the federal government.² The right to organize and to negotiate, without the right to exercise some form of sanctions or strike, left employees in a position where they had no real power. Despite their illegality, work stoppages, strikes, and other types of interruption of services occurred. After several years of unsatisfactory experience under Executive Order 10988, President Nixon invoked Executive Order 11941, which became effective January 1, 1970. This order provided for the use of binding arbitration in impasse situations

¹Robert L. Walter, The Teacher and Collective Bargaining (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1975), pp. 10-11.

²Ibid., p. 13.

concerning federal employees.¹ Within the recent past, collective bargaining, or collective negotiation, as it is frequently called in education, has been extended to public employment, including public schools and colleges.

Collective Negotiations in Education

Professional negotiation in education has been defined as

a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local staff organization and the school board, which provides an orderly method for the school board and staff organization to negotiate on matters of mutual concern, to reach agreement on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of an impasse.²

In discussing the differences in terminology, Lieberman stated that the differences between collective bargaining and professional negotiation are not at all clear. He stated:

One problem is that as a result of organizational propaganda, both "collective bargaining" and "professional negotiation" have been unduly subject to "persuasive definitions," i.e., definitions to resolve policy questions instead

¹Lloyd W. Ashby, James E. McGinnis, and Thomas E. Persing, Common Sense in Negotiations in Public Education (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1972), pp. 3-4.

²T. M. Stinnett, Jack Kleinmann, and Martha Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 2.

of making it possible to analyze them objectively.¹

Lieberman proposed the term "collective negotiations" to eliminate the problem of connotations associated with collective bargaining and professional negotiation. He regards collective negotiation as a process whereby employees as a group and their employers make offers and counter-offers in good faith on the conditions of their employment relationship for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. A written document incorporating any such agreement is executed if requested by either party.²

Movement of Teacher Organizations

Because the initiation for collective negotiations comes largely from teacher organizations, its historical development is closely related to the policies and actions

¹Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966), p. 2.

²Ibid., pp. 1-7.

NOTE: For the purposes of this study, the term "negotiations" is used to denote the teacher-school board procedure for establishing a contract. It is intended to include the process of collective bargaining, advocated by the American Federation of Teachers, and the process of professional negotiation, advocated by the National Education Association. Formal teacher-school procedures for establishing contracts have become commonplace within the last fifteen years.

of these organizations, the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. However, for most practical purposes, 1960 marks the beginning of the collective negotiations movement in public education. The 1960's were years of intensive organizational rivalry between the AFT and the NEA. In the early sixties, local and state organizations affiliated with the NEA enrolled the largest number of teachers who belonged to any employee group. The AFT had a smaller membership enrollment but these members were in metropolitan school systems. The teacher unions were very successful in organizing and winning representation rights in the major metropolitan cities, especially in the Northeast.¹ In 1961, the AFT affiliate, the United Federation of Teachers, won representation rights for New York Schools. In 1962, the AFT acquired membership in the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO and began receiving financial aid in its organizing efforts.²

Under the press of organizational competition, the NEA became a different organization. At the 1962 Denver convention the following resolutions marked both the NEA's entry into collective negotiations and the development of

¹Walter, op. cit., pp. 15-21.

²Charles R. Perry and Wesley Wildman, The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 3-11.

the concept of "professional negotiations:"

The National Education Association calls upon boards of education in all school districts to recognize their identity of interest with the teaching profession.

The National Education Association insists on the right of professional associations through democratically selected representatives using professional channels, to participate with boards of education in the determination of policies of common concern, including salary and other conditions for professional service.

The Association believes that procedures should be established which provide an orderly method for professional education associations and boards of education to reach mutually satisfactory agreements. These procedures should include provisions for appeal through designated educational channels when agreement cannot be reached.

Under no circumstances should the resolution of differences between professional associations and boards of education be sought through channels set up for handling industrial disputes. The teacher's situation is completely unlike that of an industrial employee. A board of education is not a private employer, and a teacher is not a private employee. Both are public servants.

The National Education Association calls upon its members and upon boards of education to seek state legislation and local board action which clearly and firmly establishes these rights for the teaching profession.¹

The National Education Association's recognition and commitment to the concept of professional negotiations can be followed through the official positions as stated in the

¹National Education Association of the United States, Addresses and Proceedings of the One-Hundredth Annual Meeting (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962), pp. 174-75.

Addresses and Proceedings of the annual conventions. The 1972 resolution states the current position in regard to Professional Negotiation and Grievance Procedures:

The National Education Association believes that local associations and school boards must negotiate written master contracts. Such contracts shall result from negotiation in good faith between associations and school boards, through representatives of their choosing, to establish, maintain, protect, and improve terms and conditions for professional service and other matters of mutual concern, including a provision for agency shop.

The Association encourages local affiliates to see that teachers are guaranteed a realistic opportunity for decisive participation in the establishment of instructional policies. Procedures for the resolution of impasse must be included. Grievance procedures shall be provided in the master contract with definite steps to appeal the application or interpretation of local school board policies and agreements. Binding arbitration shall be a part of the grievance procedure.

Those representing local affiliates in the negotiation process shall be granted released time without loss of pay.

Faculty and building level administrators, in order to preserve professional relationships within school staffs, should not be negotiators for school boards. The Association recommends establishment of personnel offices at the central administrative levels to represent school boards in negotiation.

The Association urges the extension of the rights of professional negotiation to the faculties of higher education.

The Association also recommends that state affiliates seek statutory penalties for school boards that do not bargain in good faith or do not comply with negotiated agreements.

The Association urges its members and affiliates to seek state legislation that clearly and firmly

mandates the adoption of professional negotiation agreements.

The Association will cooperate with its affiliates to encourage new teachers to accept initial employment in those areas or districts where master contracts have been negotiated with the professional organization.

Members of the profession should be involved in the recruitment, orientation, evaluation, transfer, promotion, and dismissal of all professional personnel.

The rights and privileges of all teachers should be respected regardless of what organization has sole negotiation rights.¹

The American Federation of Teachers' position in regard to Collective Bargaining, Collective Action, and Political Action is stated:

Collective Bargaining Goal: Recognition of the right of teachers and other nonsupervisory educational employees to negotiate written agreements with their school boards through organizations of their own choice. Such agreements should cover salaries, fringe benefits, working conditions, and all other matters of interest to teachers. They should include strong grievance procedures for enforcement of the terms of the agreement and for the elimination of inequities suffered by individuals.²

Collective Action Goal: To develop techniques of collective action which give teachers the power to make collective bargaining meaningful.³

¹National Education Association of the United States, Addresses and Proceedings of the One Hundredth and Tenth Annual Meeting (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1972), pp. 687-688.

²American Federation of Teachers, Goals of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, Number 16 (Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, n.d.), p. 4.

³Ibid.

Political Action Goal: To be fully involved in the democratic political process through participation in voter registration and election campaigns and voluntary contributions.¹

As the competition and conflict over representation rights and membership lessened, and as philosophical distinctions of the organizations blurred, the movement toward merging the two organizations into a single powerful voice of American teachers developed. Formal merger of the organizations into one organization is an issue under consideration. Both organizations have formally organized political-action groups. Both agree on the desirability of action designed to elect public officials friendly to education causes.

Walter viewed the implications of a merger as "awesome."² The NEA is one of the world's largest employee organizations. The teamsters and the auto-workers unions are of comparable size. In addition, the NEA has a close cooperative working relationship with the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees which is the fastest growing union in the nation.³ The membership of the AFT is 425,000 mostly consisting of teachers in major

¹Ibid., p. 12.

²Walter, op. cit., p. 17.

³Ibid.

metropolitan areas.¹ Its affiliation with the 130 other nationwide unions in the AFL-CIO, with their 14 million members, gives it added strength.²

With Albert Shanker's 1974 election to the presidency of the AFT, in addition to his positions as president of both the United Federation of Teachers (New York City) and the statewide New York State United Teachers, the movement toward merger has gained impetus.³ John Ryor, the president of the NEA, views 1976 as the "biggest political year in Association history." He stated:

We need to assure the election of another pro-education congress and a President who will support our two top priorities: one-third federal funding for public elementary and secondary education, and collective bargaining for teachers and other public employees.⁴

Causal Factors

In a review of the literature related to the causal factors in the emergence of negotiations in public education, several writers have discussed possible causes. In 1966, Lieberman and Moskow identified the following factors as

¹Bernard Bard, "Albert Shanker: Portrait in Power," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (March, 1975), 466-72.

²American Federation of Teachers, op. cit., p. 3.

³Bard, loc. cit.

⁴John Ryor, "This is the Election Year Teachers Have Been Waiting For," NEA Reporter, XV (April, 1976), 3.

causes: (1) the need for effective teacher representation at the local level; (2) changes in teacher attitudes; (3) larger school districts; (4) the "snowball" effect; (Every time a teacher organization and a school board negotiate, it makes it more difficult for other teacher organizations and school boards to justify their refusal to do so); and (5) developments outside of education, such as state legislation to enable the employees of public agencies to bargain.¹

Corwin considered the most important basis of teachers' sense of power to be the growing specialization within teaching. He viewed conflict as probably more closely related to the way existing economic resources are allocated than to the absolute level of income of a system. He viewed an underlying cause of teacher discontent as the lack of participation in decision-making power.²

Perry and Wildman mentioned two additional causes as: (1) the increasing percentage of males in the teaching force; and (2) the NEA/AFT rivalry.³ Myers identified the following factors affecting teacher militancy: (1) inadequate

¹Lieberman and Moskow, op. cit., pp. 55-61.

²Ronald G. Corwin, "Teacher Militancy in the United States: Reflections on Its Sources and Prospects," Teacher Power: Theory Into Practice, VII (April, 1968), 96-102.

³Perry and Wildman, op. cit., pp. 13-15.

teacher compensation; (2) dissatisfaction with the schools; (Many educators believe that the schools are not fulfilling their societal role); (3) societal demands toward more democratic institutions; and (4) countervailing power. Teachers have gained a position of countervailing power as a direct response to the power of monopoly held by boards of education.¹

Myers believed that collective bargaining and teacher governance, working in concert, will provide an improved educational program for students and an occupational group that is truly professionalized.² In looking ahead at the use of teacher power in negotiations, Frymier wrote that "negotiations probably hold a greater potential for the improvement of education than any series of events or activities which have occurred in the last fifty years."³ He further added:

Far more promising than the "national curriculum projects," ESEA programs, or even school desegregation efforts, professional negotiations may enable us to come directly to grips with ourselves, our attitudes, values, knowledge, objectives, and skills.⁴

¹Donald Myers, Teacher Power-Professionalization and Collective Bargaining (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973), pp. 95-96.

²Ibid., p. 3.

³Jack R. Frymier, "Teacher Power, Negotiations, and the Roads Ahead," Teacher Power: Theory Into Practice, VII (April, 1968), 104.

⁴Ibid.

Giandomenico investigated the relationship between a modified version of Maslow's five categories of needs and advocacy of organized collective action, militancy, among public school teachers. Militancy was thought to be related to the degree of imbalance between that which the school formal organization demands from teachers in role performance in pursuit of organizational goals and that which it gives to them in the form of need-satisfaction. He found that teachers whose scores indicated that they are highly militant are more concerned with satisfaction of the higher order needs for self-actualization and autonomy than for lower order need-satisfaction. Collective bargaining could be viewed as a tool for removing obstacles preventing higher order need-fulfillment. This kind of negotiation may be called eupsychian bargaining.¹

Summary

In the review of the literature related to the development of collective negotiations in education, writers noted the historical background of collective bargaining in the private sector and the growing trend toward collective bargaining in the public sector. Since 1960, collective bargaining has been extended to public employment, including

¹Lawrence L. Giandomenico, "Teacher Needs, Militancy, and the Scope of Collective Bargaining," The Journal of Educational Research, LXVI (February, 1973), 257-59.

public schools and colleges. Its historical development is closely related to the policies and actions of teacher organizations. Both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers have formally organized political-action groups and agree on the goals of electing pro-education public officials and collective bargaining legislation for public employees.

A search of the literature has identified possible causes for the movement of teacher organizations toward more powerful roles in policy formulation and decision-making through the process of negotiations. Viewed as causal factors are the need for effective representation at the local level, larger school districts, changes in teacher attitudes, inadequate teacher compensation, the increasing number of males in the teaching force, collective bargaining enabling legislation, the NEA/AFT rivalry, the growing specialization and professionalization within teaching, the need for self-actualization, the lack of participation in decision-making power, dissatisfaction with the schools, and societal demands toward more democratic institutions.

A review of the literature indicated that the causal factors of the development of collective negotiations in education are both psychological and sociological in nature. These factors are viewed in a societal context in the next section of the review of literature.

PUBLIC POLICY CONTEXT

By the early 1970's, there existed in the literature a substantial research base which viewed the school as a political institution. Iannaccone and Cistone pointed out that there is and always has been a dynamic relationship between educational policies and societal change. Political culture is a powerful determinant of the style and structure of educational politics. They further argue that the dominance of labor interests in the governance of education is expanding the autonomy of teachers and, by implication, is contracting the power of school boards and their agents.¹

Wirt's concept of a political system is understood to be that organization, found in every society, which is legitimized to engage in "authoritative allocation of resources and values."² Wirt suggested that because schools can grant boons of resources and values, what they do and teach can become matters of significant but differing preferences among citizens, thereby setting the scene for political conflict focused upon school authorities. This conflict matrix is no different conceptually than that

¹Laurence Iannaccone and Peter J. Cistone, The Politics of Education, Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, ERIC Document ED 091 803, 1974.

²Frederick M. Wirt, ed., The Polity of the School: New Research in Educational Politics (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1975), p. xiv.

found around legislatures, courts, or executives. His book presents some of the most current research demonstrating the applicability of traditional political analysis categories to schools.¹

In an earlier work, Wirt and Kirst described the intersect between politics and education and attempted to demonstrate that even "professional" tasks such as curriculum decisions are highly political. Educators acknowledge that demands of the community, national, state or local, affect the curriculum. The acknowledgement of this force is defined by Wirt and Kirst as the ultimately political basis of curriculum.² Generally, educators have regarded curricular decisions as professional matters to be decided on technical grounds by teachers, principals, supervisors, and directors of curriculum. The authors maintain that there is almost a total absence of the political viewpoint in curricular research. The questions of which persons and groups mold the curriculum, in whose interests, and in what way have not been asked "insistently and incisively."³ They view these questions as important and relevant

¹Ibid.

²Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, The Political Web of American Schools (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972), pp. 202-225.

³Wirt and Kirst, op. cit., p. 203.

political questions. Also, the concepts of conflict and accommodation have seldom been applied in curricular discourse.

There is recent evidence in the literature to indicate that educational leaders are reflecting upon the kinds of questions and concerns raised by writers such as Wirt and Kirst. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1975 Yearbook is a discussion of the use of political analysis as a tool to study the particular interests of people involved in the schools.¹ In the 1974 Yearbook, Dodson observed that the basic issue confronting American education is that it serves a society characterized by dissension and conflict, and its organization is still for a society in which there was a high degree of consensus.² He further stated that we have moved from the "consent of the governed" concept of political process to an era of participatory democracy.³ The populace wants "a piece of the action." Parents, teachers, and minorities

¹James B. Macdonald and Esther Zaret, eds., Schools in Search of Meaning, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1975 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975).

²Dan W. Dodson, "Authority, Power, and Education," Education for an Open Society, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1974 Yearbook, eds., Delmo Della-Dora and James E. House (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), pp. 99-108.

³Ibid., p. 100.

have formed organizations to create a power base.¹ Dodson argued that the conflict model implies shared power and the decisions collectively arrived at by a participatory set of actors who have equity in the issues.²

In the same Yearbook, Della-Dora suggested an open society as one model for bringing all segments of our population into the decision-making process. Such a model would involve using power not only for the needs of individuals and groups, but also for the mutual benefit of all groups and persons in creating and maintaining an open society.³ Della-Dora, as ASCD President, developed this theme more fully in a speech presented at the 1976 Annual Conference. He proposed a collaborative model for curriculum development involving teachers, parents, and students. He discussed synergy, a synthesis of energy of a group of people working together, as useful in curriculum development and educational improvement.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 102.

²Ibid., p. 107.

³Delmo Della-Dora and James E. House, eds., Education for an Open Society, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1974 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), p. 97.

⁴Delmo Della-Dora, "Democracy and Education: Who Owns the Curriculum?", an address presented at the 1976 Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference, Miami Beach, March 13-17, 1976. (Tape available from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.)

A mapping of the political system for curricular policy is complex. It involves three levels of government, foundations, accrediting associations, national testing agencies, textbook-software companies, special interest groups, such as the John Birch Society, college and university professors, and their professional associations, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the lay public, and the school board. Moreover, there is a configuration of leverage points within a particular school system that involves teachers, supervisors, principals, department chairpersons, assistant superintendent for instruction, and superintendent.¹

According to Broudy, the major influences in determining educational strategy in the elementary and secondary schools are the foundations, the U. S. Office of Education, the education industries, and the teachers' unions or associations.² Teachers have become important protagonists in the politicization of the schools. Guthrie and Craig suggested that teachers will benefit most by taking a rational and realistic approach and by seeking the initiative in working out cooperative liaisons between the

¹Wirt and Kirst, loc. cit.

²Harry S. Broudy, The Real World of the Public Schools (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972), p. 249.

community, the administration, and legislative bodies.¹

In discussing the role of the curriculum worker in education, Joyce argued that curriculum specialists of all types have one thing in common: they have been co-opted into the service of a bureaucratic, monolithic, largely dehumanized educational system. The curriculum worker has been bureaucratized much as functionaries in other social institutions throughout the complex societies of the world.²

Joyce described the curriculum worker as a member of a large cadre of persons who deal with educational planning, the training and supervision of educational personnel, and the development of educational materials. The collective whole of these persons, their expertness, and their activity constitute the "field" of curriculum. The curriculum field is still relatively undefined, according to Joyce. The field has no overarching "metasystem", known to all or most its practitioners, which enables comparisons of and choices between all the alternative approaches. There are knowledgeable curriculum workers who are acquainted with

¹James W. Guthrie and Patricia A. Craig, Teachers and Politics (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1973), p. 33.

²Bruce R. Joyce, "The Curriculum Worker of the Future," The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect, Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 307-355.

the alternatives but generally they tend to "do their own thing." Joyce described a framework for generating new types of educational institutions with changing roles of curriculum workers.¹

As a reaction to the first study undertaken to explore public attitudes toward the governance of public education, Webb stated "the public's notion of what school boards are and what they do is dismally distorted."² The poll's findings indicate that a majority of adults do not believe that school boards should have final authority (over decisions of their school administrations) in several crucial areas of policy-making in which school boards do have final authority by law. The ten categories of policy-making, which minorities of the public see as school board responsibilities are school budget and taxes; building new schools and facilities; teacher salaries and contracts; providing transportation; changing school attendance boundaries; which teachers to hire; what subjects to teach; what textbooks to use; maintaining student discipline; and what teacher methods to use. Only one policy-making category, hiring of principals and superintendent, was picked by a

¹Ibid.

²Harold V. Webb, "A New Gallup Study: What the Public Really Thinks of Its School Boards," The American School Board Journal, CLXII (April, 1975), p. 36.

majority of adults as the actual legal responsibility of school boards.¹

The findings related to the question of who the public thinks negotiates with teachers are only one third of the public knows that teachers negotiate with the school board; one fifth believes that teachers negotiate with the school administration; and another third doesn't know with whom teachers actually negotiate.²

A few more of the findings are: a third of the adults have no opinion (favorable or unfavorable) about their local school boards; nearly two-thirds cannot name a single thing their local school boards have done during the past year; almost one half of the adults don't know how they got the school boards they have; 38 percent believes that school boards act as representatives of the public; and 58 percent names "the school board" as one of several agencies or groups "responsible for running the public school system" in their communities.³ Webb announced the principal objective of a nationwide public information program of the National School Boards Association is "setting the public straight on school boards."⁴

¹Ibid., pp. 36-40, 58.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 36.

Summary

Educational decision making is tied to the political process. Tensions, because of different value bases and group interests, generate conflict over how the school system is to allocate its resources. Conflict over political power in education seems to be growing more intense through the interaction between teacher power groups and their efforts in getting "a piece of the action" through negotiations, the demand for accountability, the stability and decline in school enrollments, the cost of financing education, and the potentiality for unorganized interests to coalesce.

LEGAL BASIS OF NEGOTIATIONS

The process of negotiations assumes parity of legal standing between the parties and rough parity of power. Bilateral determination of the terms and conditions of employment through negotiations means that neither party has the ability to impose its will on the other and that each is able, in law and in fact, to veto the proposals of the other.¹

Teacher organizations have pressed for the enactment of legislation which would require school boards to negotiate

¹Donald H. Wollet and Robert H. Chanin, The Law and Practice of Teacher Negotiations (Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1974), pp. 1:6 to 1:7.

with teacher organizations. While continuing the press for legislation, both on state and federal levels, teacher organizations have turned to the United States Constitution as a vehicle for obtaining certain negotiations rights. After citing numerous federal and state court decisions, Wallet and Chanin concluded that the constitutional rights of employees in the private sector extend to employees in the public sector, and that the latter have a federally protected right to form organizations and through these organizations make requests for improvements in their terms and conditions of employment. They further stated that the question remains as to whether these rights include the right to engage in collective bargaining or negotiations.¹

The basis of the legal definition of collective bargaining in the United States is the following provision of Section 8 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act:

For the purpose of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession.²

¹Ibid., pp. 1:1 to 1:42.

²Chester Newland, "Collective Bargaining Concepts: Applications in Governments," Public Administration Review, XXVIII (March/April, 1968), 119-124.

The following requirements of collective bargaining are present in the Taft-Hartley definition: (1) designation both of management and the exclusive representatives of the employees, with mutual legal obligations; (2) meeting and conferring in good faith; (3) bargaining on wages, hours, terms, and conditions of employment; (4) the agreement to be embodied in a written contract; and (5) bilateral administration, interpretation, and enforcement of the agreement. According to Newland, each of the requirements merits consideration in adapting collective bargaining to governments.¹

The language of the Taft-Hartley Act defines the negotiable areas as "wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment." Nigro pointed out that as a result of Supreme Court decisions, negotiations cover many other areas besides economic benefits. Although no court or the National Labor Relations Board has said it would go this far "all decisions in an enterprise are potentially open to bargaining since all affect the worker."² The scope of the bargaining and the consequent erosion of management rights has been the greatest in public education, according to

¹Ibid.

²Felix A. Nigro, "The Implications for Public Administration," Public Administration Review, XXVIII (March/April, 1968), 142.

Nigro.¹

Mannix suggested a list of parallels between private sector collective bargaining and public sector collective bargaining. Both private sector and public sector employees have organized around similar issues. These issues included a desire for job security, improved wages and working conditions, the need for a united work force, and the need for effective political representation. The impact of enabling legislation on both sectors of the economy has been similar. In the broad areas of unfair labor practices, contract administration, pattern bargaining, and bargaining scope, private sector experience usually sets precedent. He further stated that private sector experience is complex enough to provide support for nearly anything a public school bargainer on either side of the table may wish to consider.²

Thus far all legislative action regarding the negotiating rights of nonfederal public school teachers and educators has been on the state level. Wollet and Chanin view a statutory structure for negotiations as preferable for the following reasons: (1) legislation provides an orderly method for resolving disputes over representation peaceably;

¹Ibid.

²Thomas Mannix, "Labor Negotiations and Teacher Contract Bargaining, Parallels and Problems," Educational Leadership, XXXII (April, 1975), 441-443.

(2) legislation provides a basis for the orderly, equitable, and sensible resolution of the basic and subsidiary issues raised in a dispute over representation; (3) if the election is truly to reflect teacher free choice, and if negotiations are to function properly, it is desirable, if not essential, that the rights of teachers to organize, and to engage in activities related to negotiations be protected by statute against abridgement; and (4) statutory machinery needs to be available for equitable resolution of disputes at the negotiating table.¹

Starting around 1965, states began to enact collective bargaining legislation for public employees. Today, thirty-one states have legislation covering at least one area of public education personnel.² Figure 1 illustrates the collective bargaining coverage by state.

Collective bargaining for public employees was a top legislative issue in the states in 1975 and continues to persist in 1976. The Research and Information Services Department of the Education Commission of the States identified forty-five states that considered collective bargaining legislation for education personnel during 1975.

¹Wollet and Chanin, op. cit., pp. 1:32 to 1:33.

²Doris Ross, '76 Update: Collective Bargaining in Education, A Legislator's Guide (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, January, 1976).

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING COVERAGE BY STATE						
	All Public Employees	All Education Personnel	Kindergarten-High School		Postsecondary	
			Professional	Classified	Professional	Classified
Alabama						
Alaska			•		•	•
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California			□	□		
Colorado						
Connecticut			□			
Delaware			□		□	
Florida	•	•	•	•	•	•
Georgia						
Hawaii	•	•	•	•	•	•
Idaho			□			
Illinois						
Indiana			•			
Iowa	•	•	•	•	•	•
Kansas	□	□	□	□	□	□
Kentucky						
Louisiana						
Maine			•	•		•
Maryland			□	□		
Massachusetts	•	•	•	•	•	•
Michigan			•	•	•	
Minnesota	•	•	•	•	•	•
Mississippi						
Missouri				□		□
Montana			•		•	
Nebraska			□		•	•
Nevada			•	•		
New Hampshire						•
New Jersey	•	•	•	•	•	•
New Mexico						
New York	•	•	•	•	•	•
North Carolina						
North Dakota			•			
Ohio						
Oklahoma			•	•		
Oregon	•	•	•	•	•	•
Pennsylvania	•	•	•	•	•	•
Rhode Island	•	•	•	•	•	•
South Carolina						
South Dakota	•	•	•	•	•	•
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont			□	•	• ²	• ²
Virginia						
Washington			□	•	• ³	•
West Virginia						
Wisconsin			•	•	• ⁴	•
Wyoming						

KEY

• Bargaining required by law

□ Parties must "meet and confer"

Research: Doris M. Ross

1 All but 6 counties 2 Excluding state university 3 Community colleges only 4 Two-year colleges only

Figure 1. Collective-Bargaining Coverage by State.

From Compact, IX (February, 1975), 16.

Over three hundred bills relating to this issue were considered, however, the nineteen states having no enabling legislation at the end of 1974 retained their status quo. The report predicted that in states with bargaining laws, new legislative sessions will reflect a high level of interest in the issue with the acceptance or rejection of amendatory proposals to tighten or loosen, expand or repeal, the coverage already on the state books.¹

The question of whether the federal government should enact a collective bargaining law covering state and local employees is being debated. There is a question as to the constitutional authority of the Federal Government to regulate the employment relationship between state and local governmental employees and their governmental employer.² Weitzman pointed out that many observers question the wisdom or necessity of imposing a preemptive uniform bargaining law on all jurisdictions, especially since several states have enacted their own comprehensive statutes, such as Iowa.³ Figure 1 shows the states with comprehensive statutes. Lieberman stated that federal legislation could create

¹Ross, op. cit., pp. 1-3.

²Wollet and Chanin, op. cit., pp. 1:40 to 1:42.

³Joan Weitzman, "A Review of Significant Public Sector Labor Relations Developments," CLM 25 Iowa: Iowa Public Employer-Employee Relations, I (Summer, 1975), 1-4.

confrontations between federal government and state-local governments. Since political promises can be foiled by bargaining outcomes, states with bargaining rights should be exempted from federal law. A federal law would inevitably result in a new balance of power between management and public employee unions, according to Lieberman.¹

Two federal public employee bargaining bills were introduced in the 93rd Congress and re-introduced in the 94th. The Coalition of American Public Employees, consisting of the NEA, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, and the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees, is pressing for federal legislation.² No hearings are anticipated in 1976 for either of the bills.³

The Iowa Public Employment Relations Act was approved during the 1974 Legislative session. The law went into effect July 1, 1974. The duty to bargain began on July 1, 1975, for all except state employees. June 1, 1976, was the effective date for state employees.

¹Myron Lieberman, Neglected Issues in Federal Public Employee Collective Bargaining Legislation, Paper presented at National Conference of State Legislators, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1975, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 105 615, 1975.

²Wollet and Chanin, loc. cit.

³Ross, op. cit., pp. 3, 46-49.

Pope viewed the Act as a workable law with a good prognosis for future public employment labor relations in Iowa. An effort must be made by the leadership of the governing bodies of public employers and of employee organizations to give the Act a chance to work. The negotiation of a first contract is difficult. In a discussion of the scope of negotiations, Pope expressed the opinion that mandatory subjects of collective bargaining include only those subjects listed in section 9 of the Act plus "other matters mutually agreed upon."¹

Section 9 of the Act reads as follows:

SCOPE OF NEGOTIATIONS. The public employer and the employee organization shall meet at reasonable times, including meetings reasonably in advance of the public employer's budget-making process, to negotiate in good faith with respect to wages, hours, vacations, insurance, holidays, leaves of absence, shift differentials, over-time compensation, supplemental pay, seniority, transfer procedures, job classifications, health and safety matters, evaluation procedures, procedures for staff reduction, in-service training and other matters mutually agreed upon.²

Pope stated that this section read in conjunction with subsections 10(1), 10(2)(e), and 10(3)(c) appears to create a class of mandatory subjects of collective bargaining

¹Lawrence E. Pope, "Analysis of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act," Drake Law Review, XXIV (Fall, 1974), 1-51.

²The Iowa Public Employment Relations Act, Iowa Code Section 20 (1974), Section 9.

similar to the National Labor Relations Act. Under the NLRA, a mandatory subject must be bargained. He expressed the view that only mandatory subjects can probably be taken through impasse proceedings up to final binding arbitration.¹

Should a school board agree to discuss curriculum and instruction related items, they would fall into the category of "other matters mutually agreed upon" and join the list of mandatory subjects, according to Pope. The opening up of discussion on a non-mandatory item turns it into a mandatory subject and it could be carried into binding arbitration.²

The Public Employment Relations Board, in rules related to "other matters mutually agreed upon," stated:

660-6.1(20) SCOPE OF NEGOTIATIONS. The scope of negotiations shall be provided in section nine of the Act. Either party may introduce other matters for negotiation, and negotiation on such other matters may continue until resolved by mutual agreement of the parties or until negotiations reach the fact-finding or arbitration stage of impasse. Unresolved other matters shall be excluded from the fact-finding or arbitration processes unless submission has been mutually agreed upon by the parties. Such agreement shall be in writing, dated, signed by the parties or their bargaining representatives, and shall list with specificity the other matters subject to the fact-finding or arbitration process. Such agreement is applicable

¹Pope, op. cit., p. 33.

²Ibid.

only to negotiations toward the collective bargaining agreement then sought and is not binding upon parties for future negotiations.¹

Summary

Collective bargaining is now a legal fact of life in public education in Iowa. A law governs the conduct of negotiations and an administrative agency has been created to implement the law. Collective bargaining for public employees continues to be a legislative issue both on the state and federal level of public policy.

BARGAINING STRATEGIES

Young discussed the proposition that bargaining is an important social phenomenon. At the general level, it occupies an important place in the theory of games which is applicable to a wide range of human interactions. In all theories, bargaining is conceptualized as a means through which purposive actors can reach specific settlements or outcomes under conditions of strategic interaction or interdependent decision making. He defined bargaining as a means by which two or more purposive actors arrive at specific outcomes in situations which (1) the choices of actors will determine the allocation of some value(s); (2) the outcome for each participant is a function of the behavior

¹Public Employment Relations Board [660], IAC 7/1/75, p. 14.

of the other(s); and (3) the outcome is achieved through negotiations between or among players.¹

Walton and McKersie's analytical framework of negotiations is comprised of four systems of activity. Each of the systems is referred to as a subprocess. The first subprocess is distributive bargaining and its function is to resolve pure conflicts of interest. The second, integrative bargaining, functions to find common or complementary interests and solve problems confronting both parties. The third, attitudinal structuring, functions to influence the attitudes of the participants toward each other and to affect the basic bonds which relate the two parties they represent. The fourth, intraorganizational bargaining, has the function of achieving consensus within each of the interacting groups. Each subprocess has its own internal logics and its own identifiable set of instrumental acts or tactics.²

Newland pointed out that as governments adopt collective bargaining, some choice of emphasis between a conflict approach and a cooperative approach may be possible. Both conflict and cooperation, in varying degrees, characterize

¹Oran R. Young, ed., Bargaining: Formal Theories of Negotiation (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1975), pp. 3-5.

²Richard E. Walton and Robert B. McKersie, A Behavioral Theory of Labor Relations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1965), pp. 3-6.

collective bargaining relationships and are not mutually exclusive. He suggests a choice is possible in making use of the dynamic qualities of reasonableness and variety in American legal and political experience.¹

Mannix described a three phase continuum on which collective bargaining in both the private and public sector can be plotted. Elements of each of these phases can be identified in any bargaining relationship: (1) an organizational phase, (2) a contract formulation phase, and (3) a contract administration phase. He stated one difference between private and public sector bargaining as being the opportunity for unions to by-pass management to visit directly with legislators and elected officials who control budgets and legislation.²

Perry and Wildman, as a result of research, found an evolutionary process in the conduct of negotiations on substantive conflict issues. The salary issue was the central position in negotiations. In general, the first non-salary issues to be negotiated relate to organizational powers and prerogatives. The next major set of demands were those regarding the work for which teachers receive their salary. The final set of issues to receive serious attention are

¹Newland, op. cit., pp. 118-119, 126.

²Mannix, op. cit., pp. 442-443.

"policy" issues. In practice, policy issues include such matters as staff and pupil integration, student discipline, grading systems, promotion policies, curriculum development, textbook selection, and basic methodological innovation. The initial thrust in the policy area tends to be toward control of teacher representation on existing advisory committees and the establishment of new committees where none exist, including committees to consult with the superintendent and principals on a regular basis.¹ They also found that the establishing of a collective bargaining relationship is perceived by management as a threat to its ability to control the enterprise. This perception was most pronounced in those systems in which full-scale collective bargaining appeared as a result of either a change in state law or a dramatic change in local teacher organizations attitudes and policies.²

Frost proposed an alternative model of collective bargaining for public schools based on a shared decision-making concept. Two elements are added to the industrial model: (1) shared decision-making opportunities prior to collective bargaining sessions, and (2) continuous communication during the sessions. Prior to negotiations there

¹Perry and Wildman, op. cit., pp. 109-136.

²Ibid., p. 71.

must be many formal and informal avenues of shared decision-making within the school district. Formal committees should be operating to allow much interchange between administrators, teachers, students, community residents and parents. There should be numerous opportunities for informal shared decision-making on a one-to-one basis throughout the year. Communication throughout the year and especially during the collective bargaining sessions helps to strengthen the concept of teamwork by all parties.¹

Frymier referred to a similar model as the "professional model." This model is aimed at serving the needs of students and youth and derives its authority from the competence of the members of the group. Decisions of practitioners who adopt the professional model, do not presume a primary consideration for the people of the state or for themselves, but for the students to be served.²

Citizen advocacy groups have proposed that the traditional bilateral process be made tripartite: board, union, and citizens at the bargaining table. Cheng suggested several

¹Donald R. Frost, A position paper presented at a General Assembly on Collective Bargaining, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference, March 15, 1976, Miami Beach, Florida. (Mimeographed)

²Frymier, op. cit., p. 104; see also Bernard W. Kinsella and others, The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation, For the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Committee on the Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 035 080, 1969.

strategies for opening up the process to include community participation.¹ The arguments for expanding the current relationship between collective bargaining and the public are

1. The public has the right to influence effectively the nature and quality of local public education.
2. Collective bargaining in education is inevitable.
3. It is naive to assume that all educational policy can be kept off the negotiating table because even bread-and-butter issues indirectly affect educational quality and, hence, policy.
4. When educational policy is negotiated (by the two parties), the public loses control.
5. Just when school boards need to be strong and representative of the community, some school boards are weak and unrepresentative of sizable elements of politically, culturally, economically and educationally diverse communities.
6. During the bargaining process, the public's views and desires are often overlooked or compromised.
7. Schools should establish better two-way communication procedures between the boards and their various publics to ensure that the public's stake in collective bargaining is not overlooked or in any way compromised.²

¹Charles W. Cheng, "Community Representation in Teacher Collective Bargaining: Problems and Prospects," Harvard Educational Review, XLVI (May, 1976), 153-174.

²Philip G. Jones, "Should the Public Join You and Your Teachers at the Bargaining Table?", The American School Board Journal, CLXII (September, 1975), 27-31.

Summary

An understanding of varied approaches to collective bargaining in education and their relationship to different concepts, practices, and problems is needed. Several models of bargaining strategies have been suggested in the literature. The varied strategies included bilateral, trilateral, and multilateral processes of collective bargaining. In practice, the model is essentially borrowed with few alterations from the traditional bilateral, management-labor approach. Collective bargaining is a dynamic process. There is a need for creativity and flexibility in meeting a wide variety of situations. Exploration and consideration of alternative approaches to collective bargaining are needed to improve the workable models in education.

SCOPE OF NEGOTIATIONS

Whether curriculum and instruction-related items should be included in the scope of negotiations is questioned in the literature. Information concerning this question comes from a variety of sources: teacher's organizations, boards of education, school administrators, curriculum workers, and college and university leadership. Their presentations reflect their own perceptions of the question and its ramification for the educational programs of the schools. The next section reviews the literature pertaining to the points of view of the leadership concerning this issue.

Points of View Concerning Curriculum and Instruction-Related Items in Negotiations

Curriculum and instruction-related items are viewed as negotiable by both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. Issues related to working conditions are likely to merge into decisions which affect curriculum and instruction.

The official position of the AFT concerning textbooks, teaching materials, and curriculum is the following:

Goal: Full teacher participation in selection of textbooks and materials as well as in curriculum planning and revision.¹

The official position related to academic freedom is stated as

Goal: To protect the rights of teachers to use their professional judgment in selecting materials to be used in their teaching, in conducting discussions of controversial issues, and in presenting the basic facts about our nation and the world.²

Selden quoted a past president of AFT as

We would place no limit on the scope of negotiations...in fact anything having to do with the operation of the school is a matter of professional concern and should thus be subject to collective bargaining.³

¹American Federation of Teachers, op. cit., p. 9.

²Ibid., p. 10.

³David Selden, "How Fares Curriculum in Collective Bargaining?", Educational Leadership, XXXIII (October, 1975), 28-30.

In Selden's opinion, the process by which curriculum is determined must be bargainable and curriculum content should also be bargainable. However, Selden further stated

...the use of an essentially adversary device in a sensitive area like curriculum determination is bound to make civil libertarians, of which I am one, a bit uneasy.¹

The National Education Association's Bill of Teacher Rights proclaims that the individual teacher has the right

Section 3. To exercise professional judgment in presenting, interpreting, and criticizing information and ideas, including controversial issues.

Section 4. To influence effectively the formulation of policies and procedures which affect one's professional services, including curriculum, teaching materials, methods of instruction, and school-community relations.²

According to Hottleman, the areas for negotiating in curriculum and instruction are those that affect (1) the quality of the teacher, (2) the quality of the learning environment, and (3) the structuring of school-community relationships for the improvement of education. He includes as legitimate items for negotiating the following:

1. evaluation criteria and procedures
2. professional days
3. sabbatical leave terms

¹Ibid., p. 30.

²Bill of Teacher Rights, Today's Education, LXV (March/April, 1976), gate-fold cover.

4. attendance at conferences
5. summer workshop design and compensation
6. released time for research and development
7. decision making process with respect to the following
 - a. curriculum design and development
 - b. teaching methods
 - c. teaching aids and/or materials
 - d. teacher aides
 - e. construction of facilities
 - f. textbook selection
 - g. supplies and equipment
 - h. grading and reporting¹

Research to identify the instructional problems which teachers perceive as those that keep them from teaching effectively found that teachers would like associations to negotiate conditions that affect instruction. The teachers also indicated that they wanted the associations to assure teacher representation in the decision-making process.²

The Iowa State Education Association provided guidelines and proposals for contract language to be utilized by local associations during negotiations for the 1976-77

¹Girard Hottleman, "Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction: Another Step Up on the Professional Ladder," Negotiating for Professionalization, National Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference, Washington, D.C., June 24-27, 1969, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 044 367, 1970.

²"Teacher's Instructional Problems, 1974," Today's Education, LXIII (September/October, 1974), 78-80.

contract year.¹ The proposals included the following areas covered by the Instruction and Professional Development Committees:

1. temporary leaves of absence
2. extended leaves of absence
3. sabbatical leave
4. educational aides job classification
5. professional development and educational improvement
6. supervision of student teachers
7. pupil discipline
8. personal and academic freedom
9. instructional council
10. substitutes²
11. evaluation³

The instructional council proposal is in accordance with the National Education Association's position that instructional councils (curriculum councils, educational

¹Iowa State Education Association, ISEA Master Outline Working Paper for a Comprehensive Agreement (Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, n.d.).

²Iowa State Education Association, Sample Contract Language for Areas Covered by IPD Committees (Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, n.d.).

³Iowa State Education Association, Employee Evaluation Guide (Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, August, 1975).

development councils, joint committees, professional study committees, etc.) are desirable vehicles for decision-making in curriculum and instruction. Kleinmann further stated that

Since curriculum is what teachers do, and instruction is how they do it, it follows that curriculum and instruction are essential elements of their daily working conditions and, thus, are appropriate subjects for the bargaining table.¹

The Iowa Association of School Boards prepared materials for school board members, school district negotiators, and administrators to analyze teacher associations proposals and prepare counterproposals during negotiations for the 1976-77 contract year.² The IASB views the collective bargaining agreement (contract) as a restriction upon the school board's authority.³

Weinstock and Van Horn suggested the following assumptions serve as a basis for the traditional views held by the school boards toward their relationship to teachers and to negotiations:

1. Professional negotiation is unnecessary, since the working relationship between school boards and teachers is already a satisfactory one.

¹Jack H. Kleinmann, "Curriculum Negotiation: How? To What End?", Educational Leadership, XXIX (April, 1972), 573-75.

²Iowa Association of School Boards, An Analysis of Teacher Contract Proposals (Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa Association of School Boards, 1975).

³Ibid., p. iv.

2. Professional negotiation will enable teachers to undermine administrative authority and threaten school board autonomy.
3. Whenever professional negotiation procedures are exercised, teachers are not concerned with the public's interest.
4. Whenever professional negotiation procedures are exercised, teachers are not concerned with the student's interests.
5. If an impasse does arise between teachers and board members, the ensuing disruption of the educational process would result in great loss to the students.¹

Howe recommended that negotiations be limited to salaries, fringe benefits, and negotiations procedures, at least until the parties become familiar with the process of negotiation. Boards should be cautioned in agreeing to any words or phrases that might commit them to bargaining over important district policy.²

Kleinmann noted that, historically, the bargaining process has shown an interesting cycle with respect to curriculum matters. When teachers first began to bargain, school boards charged that it was "unprofessional" to bargain for wages and fringe benefits and that teachers should

¹Henry R. Weinstock and Paul L. Van Horn, op. cit., pp. 358-63.

²Jonathan T. Howe, Collective Bargaining: What's Negotiable, Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National School Boards Association, Miami Beach, April 19-22, 1975, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 105 651, 1975.

concern themselves only with instructional and curricular matters. Now after a decade of experience, school boards and administrators were generally taking a hard line on curriculum and instruction, referring to them as management prerogatives.¹

Bishop in a discussion of the relationship of collective negotiations to curriculum and instruction attempted to keep them as separate concerns. He pointed out that curriculum and instruction are operationally interwoven with matters of salary, teacher welfare, benefits, hours of employment, or physical conditions of employment. Curriculum is viewed as "the network of plans, perceptions, procedures, and behaviors of the educational enterprise."² Bishop predicted that once wages, hours, benefits, and rights are established, curriculum and instruction will be the next logical area for negotiations. Curriculum and instruction will receive major attention because the rationale of the school as an institution must be expressed within its domain.³

Bishop maintained that the most productive,

¹Kleinmann, loc. cit.

²Leslee J. Bishop, Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction: Questions and Concerns (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967), U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document, ED 017 072, p. 5.

³Ibid., pp. 4-5.

professional and successful way is to use negotiations as a means by which fundamental curricular process and policy matters are settled, rather than looking toward the more immediate program issues. It is essential to establish contractual language where curriculum and instructional matters are concerned. Emphasis should be on process not program. He raised the question of whether the supervisor or the designated curriculum worker is to be aligned with the superintendent and his administrative staff or with the teacher and his supportive staff. Role definition, which is a difficult question, may be resolved in terms of the negotiation process or resolved on the basis of certain levels of decision-making. The negotiations process will cause realignment in the educational power structure and significant modifications in certain teacher, supervisory, and administrative roles.¹

Alfonso questioned whether negotiations is an acceptable, viable process of decision-making about curriculum and instructional matters. He viewed curriculum negotiations as a self defeating process. He stated that there must be no adversary relationships in the area of curriculum and instruction. We cannot afford to make partisan questions out of curriculum and instruction issues. He noted that curriculum workers must work effectively with both sides in

¹Bishop, loc. cit.

order to be successful in improving curriculum and instruction. He made several recommendations which, in his opinion, would be necessary before school boards and teacher organizations could eliminate an adversary relationship. Alfonso recommended the following:

1. We need a redefinition of who should make curriculum decisions.
2. We need to redefine the curriculum decision-making process.
3. We need to develop curriculum councils.
4. We must make a distinction between the teacher and his "work" problems and the teacher and his "professional" problems.
5. We must, with teachers, understand and be able to make a clear distinction between negotiating the process by which curriculum decisions will be made and negotiating curriculum issues per se. Questions of who should be involved, time allocation, and financing of curriculum study are appropriate for negotiation.
6. We must work toward the development of a professional model for negotiations.
7. All staff members must be involved in the development of negotiation agreements. Curriculum and instruction must be kept out of the negotiable item category at the outset.
8. Universities in their teacher education programs must assume responsibility for telling-it-like-it-is. They must assume some responsibility for educating students about negotiations and its legitimate role in the school. They must assist in making teachers wise negotiators.
9. University professors must cease contributing to the cleavage between teachers and administrators by planting an anti-administration bias in their undergraduates as a result of their own comments about school administrators.

10. As a profession, we need to seek out areas of mutual concern and agreement and move into a new and necessary cooperative relationship. It needs to happen at all levels of education.

Alfonso made these statements and recommendations at an annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators.¹

Hough noted three potentially divisive consequences of negotiations:

1. Negotiation of curriculum and instruction is anathema to cooperative curriculum development.
2. The tendency of other professionals to organize is divisive to the educational profession. Superintendents have organized into AASA. Middle management, principals, and supervisors, are organizing locally for bargaining rights. There has been a strong move by supervisors in ASCD to organize for welfare and other purposes.
3. Interpersonal problems and frustrations are created for both teachers and administrators as a consequence of negotiations.²

Young argued that it is extremely difficult to accept any rationale for subjecting curriculum to the negotiation area. To improve instruction, in his opinion, it is essential that staff members function as co-professionals rather

¹Robert J. Alfonso, "Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction," Negotiation Research Digest, II (May, 1969), E-1 to E-4.

²Wendell M. Hough, Jr., "A Better Curriculum Through Negotiation?", Educational Leadership, XXVI (March, 1969), 531-534.

than adversaries.¹

A consequence of negotiations which has received little attention, according to Lieberman, is the gain in the power of administrators and the corresponding decline in the power of school boards. Shifts of power has taken place within as well as between the employer and employee sides of the bargaining table. Negotiators must have the authority to negotiate. School boards have increasingly found it necessary to delegate more authority to their negotiating teams and the latter have been making more and more of the crucial decisions governing personnel relationships. Teacher negotiating teams, which are increasingly dominated by full-time professional staff, are playing the same decisive role on the teacher side.²

Summary

As a review of the literature indicates, teacher organizations desire as broad a scope of topics for negotiations as possible. The two national teacher organizations view curricular matters as negotiable. Both organizations have similar goals and similar techniques for achieving

¹William F. Young, "Curriculum Negotiation: How? To What Extent?" Educational Leadership, XXIX (April, 1972), 576-578.

²Myron Lieberman, "The Future of Collective Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (December, 1971), 214-216.

their goals. School boards as well as their state and national organizations resist the determination of educational and school district policy, including curricular matters, at the negotiating table. The problem of what should be legitimately negotiated continues to be a crucial question.

The majority opinion, with the notable exception to the teacher organization leadership, seems to indicate that the emphasis on negotiating curricular matters should be on determining procedures by which fundamental curricular process and policy are decided. The focus should be on process and not substance. The question of the roles of middle management; supervisors, coordinators, curriculum workers, is still open and not yet determined. The nature of curriculum and instruction makes it necessary that it be treated openly, intellectually, and honestly. Solutions to problems of human ideology do not lend themselves to the process of negotiations.

CONTRACT ANALYSIS RESEARCH

Research related to the actual content of negotiated teacher school-board agreements indicated that curriculum and instructional components have appeared in master contracts. Many contracts contained provisions that were curricular in nature or are closely related to curriculum.

Andrews studied the topics in the contracts of local

teacher unions and local education associations. From this study, it was found that topics ranged from salary and other economic conditions to textbook selection and release of teachers to conduct teacher-organization business. It was concluded that AFT affiliates negotiated somewhat more comprehensive contracts than did the NEA affiliates. When differences occurred, they were of degree rather than substance of topics. Andrews concluded that negotiations can be a vehicle for progress.¹

Steele attempted to determine whether or not collective bargaining had contributed to educational improvement in Michigan schools. She studied the Michigan master contracts for the school years, 1966-67 and 1967-68, and the amount and number of budget expenditures for instructional supplies for 1966-67 and 1967-68. The findings were the following:

1. There were significantly more instructional provisions in the contracts in 1967-68 than in 1966-67.
2. Large school districts tended to include a greater number of instructional provisions than smaller districts, but the difference was not statistically significant.
3. The Michigan Federation of Teachers negotiated more instructional provisions than the Michigan Education Association in the first year of teacher bargaining. The MEA significantly increased the number of instructional provisions the second year.

¹J. Edward Andrews, Jr., "What are the Issues?", Educational Leadership, XXVI (March, 1969), 535-38.

4. There was little difference in the instructional supply budgets of MFT and MEA districts the first year of bargaining. However, the second year MEA districts spent a greater percentage for instructional supplies than MFT districts.
5. The instructional supply budget for all school districts declined significantly the second year of collective bargaining.¹

Young noted that master contracts contained provisions that are curricular in nature or have serious implications for curriculum. He cited examples of such items as textbook selection procedures; teaching assignments; restrictions on classroom visitations; teaching hours; transfer policies; released time; clock length of class periods; length of school day; curriculum committee selection procedures; class size averages; length of school year; number of weekly teaching periods; preparation periods for elementary teachers; procedures for selection of instructional equipment and materials; pupil-teacher ratios; and class-size maximums.²

Miller and Newbury identified curriculum issues most closely related to contract provisions reported in national surveys. They suggest these are of value in considering

¹Marilyn Harger Steele, "Has Collective Bargaining Contributed to Instructional Improvement in Michigan Schools?" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969).

²William F. Young, "Curriculum Negotiations: Present Status-Future Trends," Educational Leadership, XXVI (January, 1969), 341-343.

the recommendations of program improvement committees which may be set up as a result of bargaining. The issues tend to be those related to the more tangible aspects of the educational program or matters that bear directly on work load or time on the job: (1) extracurricular and co-curricular issues; (2) in-service education; (3) instructional resources; (4) racially oriented concerns; and (5) special education.¹

The National Education Association sponsored contract analysis research during five survey years (1966-67 to 1970-71). The number of school systems engaged in collective bargaining, during the five survey years, have steadily increased. The percent increase of NEA affiliated bargaining units from 1966-67 to 1970-71 was 387.2. The percent increase for AFT affiliated bargaining units for the same period was 178.4. The number of NEA represented teachers increased from 4 out of 10 to 7 out of 10 teachers during the same period. As of 1970-71, 25 states had laws enabling teacher negotiations.²

A study of NEA affiliate contracts in effect for the

¹William C. Miller and David N. Newbury, Teacher Negotiations: A Guide for Bargaining Teams (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 95-134.

²National Education Association, Research Division, "The Growth of Classroom Teacher Collective Bargaining: 1966-1971," Negotiation Research Digest, VI (October, 1972), 19.

1968-69 school year was conducted to identify provisions directly or indirectly affecting the curriculum decision-making process. Of the 978 contracts studied, 451 (46.1 percent) contained one or more provisions directly or indirectly affecting the curriculum decision-making process. In 279 agreements (28.5 percent), at least one general or professional joint committee provided teachers with the opportunity to discuss curriculum. Negotiated provisions directly related to curriculum review were found in 172 agreements (17.6 percent). Specifications as to the frequency of curriculum meetings were included in twelve contracts. Compensation for teachers assigned to curriculum studies consisted of eleven provisions and extra pay was provided in two provisions. The major emphasis of the 1968-69 contracts was on teacher involvement in curriculum decisions through the establishment of curriculum councils or committees rather than the inclusion of specific curriculum content.¹

Another survey conducted by the National Education Association of 2,225 negotiated agreements for the school year 1967-68 shows that two joint areas of concern, qualifications for professional growth and in-service training, are now being negotiated by teachers and school boards.

¹National Education Association, Research Division, "Curriculum Review in Negotiation Agreements," NEA Research Bulletin, XLVIII (December, 1970), 106-108.

The total number of comprehensive agreements surveyed was 603 of the 2,225 studied. Of these 603 comprehensive agreements, 238 (39.5 percent) had provisions relative to qualifications for professional growth and/or in-service training. Many school systems are negotiating provisions to ensure the upgrading of educational instruction in addition to negotiating salary concerns.¹

The Research Division of the NEA analyzed 1970-71 negotiation agreements, effective in school systems with 1,000 or more pupils enrolled, and found 1,111 (72.7 percent of the 1,529 contracts contained provisions that established at least one joint committee. Joint committees are composed of teacher representatives and board representatives, who may be members of the administrative staff. Each committee is identified according to the objective for which it was created. The three types of committees were (1) those meeting regularly to resolve potential areas of conflict which may arise under the terms and conditions of the agreement; (2) general and professional study committees, usually designed to engage in continuing long-range investigation of a wide variety of subjects affecting education or professional policy; and (3) a topical committee composed

¹National Education Association, Research Division, "Negotiation Agreements: Qualifications for Professional Growth and In-service Training," Negotiation Research Digest, II (May, 1969), B-1 to B-11.

of teachers, administrative staff, and/or school-board members to study or plan objectives within a specific and narrowly defined area. Most of the analyzed agreements established more than one type of committee or a committee could fit more than one category. Over half of the topical committees were established to study or plan in the area of the instructional program. The next largest area of study or planning for topical committees was curriculum review.¹

The National Education Association Research Division tabulated the content of negotiation agreements for the school years of 1966-67, 1968-69, and 1970-71 to determine the trends in negotiable items for teachers. Three provisions have appeared in over 75 percent of the three comparisons of data: salary schedules, grievance procedures, and sick leave. Twelve provisions have appeared in over 50 percent of the agreements in the three survey years: pupil-teacher ratio or class size, teaching hours or day, duty-free planning periods, duty-free lunch periods, transfers, pupil discipline or assault cases, procedure for teacher evaluation, salary credit for prior experience and growth, salary increments for additional professional preparation, extra-duty pay, health insurance, and maternity leave. Increasing

¹National Education Association, Research Division, "Joint Committees Established in Comprehensive Classroom Teacher Agreements," Negotiation Research Digest, VI (September, 1972), 14-19.

in appearance, during the period from 1966-67 to 1970-71, were provisions regarding teacher qualifications, teacher aids, professional growth and in-service training, regular teachers' meetings, binding arbitration of grievances, health and life insurance, leaves of absence for personal and professional reasons, and pay periods. Provisions that have declined in appearance are the development of tax and bond issues, distribution of budgetary items, selection and distribution of textbooks, instructional aids, supervision of student extracurricular activities, integration of education, individual contract terms, teaching assignments, promotion to higher classifications, professional code of ethics, compensation for damaged or stolen property, and salary increments for additional professional preparation.¹

Ziemer investigated the role of curriculum and instruction in negotiated contracts between school boards and 14 affiliates of the NEA and 14 affiliates of the AFT. The questions asked were: (1) To what extent do selected NEA and AFT affiliate contracts contain curriculum and instruction components? (2) How does the leadership rate the curriculum and instruction components in terms of their importance in negotiations? (3) What are the differences or similarities in emphasis of the curriculum and

¹National Education Association, Research Division, "Trends in Negotiable Items for Teachers," Negotiation Research Digest, LVI (November, 1972), 13-15.

instruction components between the NEA and AFT contracts?

(4) What are the differences or similarities in emphasis of the curriculum and instruction components between the leadership of the NEA and AFT? The findings were that (1) there is a high level of agreement in the emphasis given to the component clusters by the NEA and AFT contracts; (2) there is a moderately high level of agreement between the ratings of the NEA and AFT leadership; (3) there is a moderately high level of agreement between the AFT leadership ratings and AFT contracts; and (4) there is a moderate level of agreement between the NEA leadership ratings and NEA affiliate contracts. Based on the facts that the AFT affiliate contracts included a greater number of curriculum and instruction components and that AFT leadership rated a greater number of components as being of primary importance, Ziemer concluded that the affiliates of the AFT place a greater emphasis on the negotiation of items which affect curriculum and instructional policies than do the affiliates of the NEA. He also concluded that the area of curriculum and instruction is considered of importance in negotiations between teacher groups and school boards.¹

¹Russell H. Ziemer and A. Gray Thompson, "Negotiations and Curriculum: NEA vs AFT," Educational Leadership, XXXI (November, 1973), 102-104.

Summary

From a review of the literature related to the actual content of teacher groups and school-boards negotiated agreements, provisions that are curricular in nature or that have serious implications for curriculum appeared in the negotiated agreements. A majority of the research reviewed was sponsored by the National Education Association during a five year period as part of overall contract analysis. Two investigators, Andrews (1967) and Ziemer (1972), studied contracts negotiated by both NEA and AFT affiliates to determine what curriculum and instruction components were included in the contracts. They both found that AFT affiliates negotiated somewhat more curriculum and instruction components than did the NEA affiliates. Steele reported similar findings to the Andrews and Ziemer investigations. Steele found there were significantly more instructional provisions, in both AFT and NEA affiliate contracts, in 1967-68 than in 1966-67. The review of research cited indicated that the area of curriculum and instruction is considered important in negotiations. The provisions included represent both process and substance components. The trend seems to indicate a thrust toward more process components than substance.

SUMMARY

Collective negotiations can be viewed either as a threat to existing powers or as an affirmative development, as Bishop observed.¹ Those active in the movement consider this development a significant step in the professionalization of teachers. As education becomes more complex, more socially involved, and more politically sensitive, the organized strength of teachers can be mobilized to obtain additional means for an improved educational program.

Educational decision-making, including those involving curricular matters, can be viewed in a public policy context. Different value bases and group interests, including teacher groups, generate conflict over how the schools allocate resources. Several models of bargaining strategies have been suggested in the literature: bilateral; trilateral; and multilateral. The model utilized in public education, with few alterations, is the bilateral, management-labor approach found in the private sector. Writers have questioned whether or not an adversarial approach, encouraged through bilateral strategies, is a viable process of decision-making about curriculum and instructional matters.

What should be legitimately negotiated continues to be discussed in the literature. In some states, such as Iowa,

¹Bishop, op. cit., p. 3.

legislation has defined the areas that are negotiable. Thirty-one states have laws authorizing collective bargaining for public employees. State legislative activity reflects a high level of interest in this issue. In recent congressional sessions, proposals have been made for federal collective bargaining legislation.

The literature pertaining to the points of view concerning curriculum and instruction-related items in negotiation comes from a variety of sources. Teacher groups and some other educational leaders view curriculum and instruction-related items as negotiable. Some opinion, generally expressed by school boards and some administrators, is that educational and curricular policy making is not negotiable. The majority opinion views the issue as focusing negotiations on curricular and instruction-related procedures and not on substance.

The review of research related to the actual content of negotiated agreements between teacher groups and school boards indicated that the area of curriculum and instruction is considered important in negotiations. Provisions in the contracts represented both process and substance components. The trend of negotiable items seems to indicate a thrust toward more process components than substance.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The major problem of this study was to determine the frequency with which curriculum and instruction-related concerns are evident in collective negotiations in Iowa and how important these concerns are as perceived by the educational leadership. The two major sources of data are (1) the statements or points of view expressed by persons in positions of leadership, and (2) an analysis of actual practice. The research design used in this study was a descriptive sample survey.¹

SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The study population was composed of the public school districts (K-12) in the state of Iowa that elected to negotiate contracts for the 1976-77 school year. A list of these districts was obtained from the Public Employment Relations Board. A probability sample of 50 school districts, stratified according to enrollment size, was randomly selected using a table of random numbers in the customary fashion.²

¹Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics (2d ed.; New York: McGraw Hill, 1972), pp. 34-85.

²Ibid.

Table 1 shows the number of districts in the selected sample according to size. The three categories of size were determined in the following manner:

1. Category One (large) was composed of school districts with pupil enrollments of 3,000 or more students.
2. Category Two (medium) was composed of school districts with pupil enrollments of 1,000 to 2,999 students.
3. Category Three (small) was composed of school districts with pupil enrollments of 999 students or fewer.

Table 1
Size and Number of Districts in Sample

Category	Pupil Enrollment	Percent	Number
One: Large	3,000 or more	6.3	4
Two: Medium	1,000 to 2,999	24.1	12
Three: Small	999 or fewer	69.2	34
Totals		99.6	50

Of the 450 public school districts (K-12), Category One represented 6.3 percent. Category Two represented 24.1

percent. Category Three represented 69.2 percent.¹

The negotiated contract from each of the selected sample districts was analyzed to obtain data to determine actual practice. A copy of each contract is on file at the Office of the Public Employment Relations Board.

To obtain the points of view of leadership, data were collected from two persons who hold positions of leadership in each of the selected school districts: (1) the person who is designated as the staff member who is most expert in curricular matters; and (2) the person who is the elected president of the local affiliate of the National Education Association. The superintendent of each of the selected school districts was asked to identify the school district's curriculum specialist to participate in the study.² The Iowa State Education Association was asked to identify the elected president of the local affiliate of each of the selected school districts.

To obtain the points of view of college and university leadership, data were collected from a random sample of

¹Department of Public Instruction, Iowa Educational Directory, 1975-76 School Year (Des Moines, Iowa: Information Services, Department of Public Instruction, 1975).

²Ibid.

75 professors from the "Professors of Curriculum Membership List."¹

INSTRUMENT

The instrument used in this study to collect data was a 34-item questionnaire. The items were selected from a list of 96 items previously identified by Ziemer.² Ziemer developed a listing of 96 items, curriculum and instruction components, from a search of the literature. In order to determine the relative perceived importance of the 96 items, Ziemer submitted the list to a panel of 120 judges. The judges represented four occupational categories directly related to the areas of curriculum and instruction: (1) teachers in elementary and secondary schools; (2) instructors in curriculum and instruction at three local universities; (3) supervisors of instruction and curriculum development for a large city school system; and (4) authors of lead articles in Educational Leadership, during the years of 1970 and 1971. The judges were asked to rate each

¹From the list of members of Professors of Curriculum which meets regularly as part of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Convention.

²Russell H. Ziemer, "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum-Instruction Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, 1972).

of the 96 items in terms of its being a primary or secondary component, or as irrelevant to the area of curriculum-instruction. Each item was identified as primary, secondary or irrelevant according to which of these categories attained the highest percentage of the judged ratings.¹

In constructing the instrument for this study, the following criteria were used to determine which items would be selected from Ziemer's list:

1. Curriculum and instruction components that are defined as mandatory subjects for collective bargaining in Iowa were excluded. Two examples of such items are: (1) evaluation procedures; and (2) in-service training.²
2. Curriculum and instruction components that are sponsored by the American Federation of Teachers were not included. These items do not pertain to Iowa because the state and the local teachers' organizations are affiliated with the National Education Association. The More Effective School Plan is an example of such an item.
3. Curriculum and instruction components that are

¹Ibid.

²Iowa, Iowa Code, Sec. 20, (1974).

required by state law in Iowa or the rules and regulations of the Department of Public Instruction of Iowa were excluded. Two examples of such items are: (1) special programs for educationally handicapped; and (2) multi-ethnic materials.

4. Curriculum and instruction components that are required by federal law were not included. Pupil integration is an example of such an item.
5. Curriculum and instruction components, identified by Ziemer, that could be considered in the category of "other matters mutually agreed upon" were selected as items for this study.¹ These items could be considered of mutual concern and discretionary in nature. In Pope's opinion, should a school board agree to discuss these items, these items become mandatory subjects for bargaining.² The Public Employment Relations Board, in rules related to "other matters mutually agreed upon," viewed such an agreement as applicable only to negotiations toward the collective bargaining agreement then sought and is not binding upon parties for future

¹Ibid.

²Lawrence E. Pope, "An Analysis of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act," Drake Law Review, XXIV (Fall, 1974), 1-51.

negotiations.¹

The rationale for the selection of the items for the instrument is that the items should represent curriculum and instruction components not identified by federal or state legislation or regulation but are judged by experts in the field as being important to curriculum and instruction. The assumption is that the proclaimed items have been recognized as being of significant importance. A copy of the instrument is in the Appendix.

The thirty-four identified curriculum-instruction components rated by the three leadership groups and used for contract analysis are the following:

1. Academic Freedom
2. Advanced Study Credit for Teachers
3. Aims of Schools
4. Audio-Visual Materials
5. Citizenship Training
6. Class Interruptions
7. Class Size
8. Course Content
9. Curriculum Change Procedures
10. Curriculum Committees
11. Curriculum Guides
12. Equipment and Supplies Availability
13. Facilities Available for Instruction
14. Faculty Meetings
15. Faculty Planning Groups
16. Grouping of Learners
17. Instructional Materials
18. Material Centers
19. Methodology
20. Parent Conferences
21. Professional Meeting Released Time

¹Public Employment Relations Board [660], IAC 7/1/75, p. 14.

22. Program Development Procedures
23. Pupil-Teacher Ratio
24. Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work
25. Resource Persons from Outside the School
26. Sabbatical Leave
27. School-Community Relationship
28. School Organization
29. Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum
30. Teacher Participation in Decision-Making
31. Teacher's Responsibilities in Classroom Activities
32. Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth
33. Textbook (required use)
34. Textbook Selection

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The Academic Computing Facilities at Drake University processed the statistical data for this study.¹ The data were analyzed to seek answers to the questions posed by this investigation. These questions are:

1. With what frequency do the identified curriculum-instruction components appear in selected contracts negotiated by the affiliates of the National Education Association (NEA) in the state of Iowa?
2. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by curriculum specialists of the selected public school districts?
3. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components

¹Norman H. Nie and others, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2d ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

negotiable items by elected presidents of the local NEA affiliates?

4. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components by professors expert in curriculum matters?
5. What are the differences or similarities in ratings of curriculum and instruction-related components as indicated by the leadership ratings of elected presidents of the local NEA affiliates, public school curriculum specialists, and professors expert in curriculum matters?

A content analysis was made of each selected contract. The contracts were analyzed to determine whether or not the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared in the contracts. The following procedure was used for each of the curriculum-instruction components of the instrument:

1. If the curriculum-instruction component did not appear in the contract, the component was recorded as being of No Importance in this instance.
2. When the curriculum-instruction component appeared once in the contract, as a subpart of a section or provision, it was recorded as being of Secondary Importance. However, when it appeared as a separate section or provision of the contract, it was recorded as being of Primary Importance.
3. When the curriculum-instruction component appeared

more than once in the contract, it was recorded as being of Primary Importance.

For the four groups of data (the three leadership groups plus the contract analysis data), frequencies were computed and presented in one-way frequency distribution tables with the absolute, relative, adjusted, and cumulative frequencies calculated for each curriculum-instruction component of the instrument. The mean, standard deviation, and variance were calculated for each frequency distribution.¹

A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not there were any significant differences between the means across the three leadership groups: (1) public school curriculum specialists; (2) elected presidents of the local NEA affiliates; and (3) professors expert in curriculum matters.² The procedure, written by Jae-On Kim and Frank J. Kohout, was used for each curriculum-instruction component item of the research instrument.³

¹Nie, op. cit., Chapter 14, "Descriptive Statistics and One-Way Frequency Distributions," pp. 181-202.

²J. P. Guilford and Benjamin Fruchter, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (5th ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 229-281; see also Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966), pp. 187-212.

³Nie, op. cit., Chapter 22, "Analysis of Variance and Covariance: Subprograms ANOVA and ONEWAY," pp. 398-433.

The least-significant difference (LSD) procedure was used as an a posteriori contrast for the significant F value (alpha level .05). The LSD is a procedure for comparing all possible pairs of group means. It is essentially a Student's t test between group means to determine which of the groups are significantly different from the others.¹

SUMMARY

A descriptive sample survey design was used in this study. A sample of 50 school districts, stratified according to size, was randomly selected from the list of school districts that elected to negotiate contracts for the 1976-77 school year. The contracts from the sample districts were analyzed to determine actual practice. To obtain the points of view of the educational leadership, data were collected from (1) school district curriculum specialists, (2) elected presidents of the local NEA affiliate, and (3) professors of curriculum.

The research instrument was a questionnaire consisting of 34 curriculum-instruction components with each component rated as being either of No Importance, Secondary Importance, or Primary Importance in negotiations. The statistical procedures were one-way frequency distribution

¹Nie, op. cit., pp. 426-428; see also Guilford and Fruchter, op. cit., pp. 243-245.

tables. The mean, standard deviation, and variance were calculated for each frequency distribution.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the data obtained from the three leadership groups. The least-significant difference procedure was used for the significant F value to determine which of the groups are significantly different from the others in its ratings of the components.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The intent of this chapter is to present the data obtained in this study and a description of the findings related to the questions posed by the investigation. Two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up mailing consisting of the questionnaire, an accompanying letter, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent to those persons who had not returned the completed questionnaire. The response rate for Group 1, the school district curriculum specialists, was 78 percent (39 of the 50 responded). Of this group, 36 were tabulated. The response rate for Group 2, the elected presidents of the NEA local affiliates, was 80.2 percent (41 of the 50 responded). Of this group, 40 were tabulated. The response rate for Group 3, the college and university curriculum professors, was 80 percent (60 of the 75 responded). Of this group, 52 returns were tabulated. The responses not tabulated were either incomplete or incorrectly marked with two or more judgments on a single item. The fourth set of data was obtained by analyzing 40 contracts. The contracts analyzed were those from districts in which both educational leaders responded (31) plus nine randomly selected from the remaining 19 in the sample.

The data and findings are reported in the following manner:

1. The ratings of each leadership group with the results of the contract analysis are shown in a separate table for each of the identified curriculum-instruction components.

2. When the F value of the analysis of variance was significant (alpha level .05), the differences between means for pairs of groups of ratings of the curriculum-instruction component are shown in a separate table following the presentation of the ANOVA data.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The data obtained with regard to the curriculum-instruction component of Academic Freedom are shown in Table 2. The analysis of variance data shows that the three leadership groups differ significantly in their ratings of the importance of Academic Freedom in negotiations. The level of statistical significance for this variance is .0001. Academic Freedom appeared in 2 contracts as being of Primary Importance. It did not appear in 38 of the contracts analyzed. Apparently, when Academic Freedom is considered important in negotiations, it is viewed as being of Primary Importance in actual practice.

Table 2

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Academic Freedom

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	4.8873	16.160*	Primary Importance	2
Within Groups	122	.3024		Secondary	
Total	124			Importance	0
			Standard	No Importance	38
Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Total	40
Group 1	36	1.8611	.6393	Mean	Standard
Group 2	38	1.3421	.5825		Deviation
Group 3	51	1.1961	.4481		
Total	125	1.4320		2.900	.441

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Elected Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

Table 3 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for the ratings of the three leadership groups of Academic Freedom. The ratings of both Group 2, the presidents of the teacher organizations, and Group 3, the professors of curriculum, differed significantly ($p < .0001$) from the ratings of Group 1, the school curriculum specialists. The presidents and the professors rated

Academic Freedom as being more important in negotiations than did the school curriculum specialists.

Table 3
Academic Freedom
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+ .519*	+.665*
Group 2		+.146
*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data obtained with regard to Advanced Study Credit for Teachers are shown in Table 4. The leadership ratings of this curriculum-instruction component did not differ significantly. It was rated approximately equally important by the school district curriculum specialists, the presidents of the local teacher organizations, and the professors. In the contract analysis, Advanced Study Credit for Teachers appeared in all the contracts studied as being of Primary Importance. This item is relatively important from the points of view expressed by the three leadership groups and very important in actual practice.

Table 4

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Advanced Study Credit for Teachers

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.2350	.615	Primary Importance	40
Within Groups	121	.3823		Secondary	
Total	123			Importance	0
				No Importance	0
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	1.7778	.6375		
Group 2	40	1.6250	.5856		
Group 3	48	1.6667	.6302	1.000	0
Total	124	1.6855			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

Table 5 shows the data relating to the curriculum-instruction component of Aims of Schools. The ratings of the leadership groups did not differ significantly between groups on the importance of this component in negotiations. Aims of Schools appeared in 3 contracts as being of Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 37 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 5

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Aims of Schools

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.6182	1.761	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3510		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	3
				No Importance	37
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.2500	.5000	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.4500	.6775		
Group 3	52	1.2308	.5813	2.925	.267
Total	128	1.3047			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The data relating to the curriculum-instruction component of Audio-Visual Materials are shown in Table 6. The leadership ratings of this component did not differ significantly. They rated this component as being important in negotiations. Group 3, the professors, rated Audio-Visual Materials somewhat more important than the other two groups rated it. This component appeared in one contract as being

of Secondary Importance. It would seem that Audio-Visual Materials was of little concern in the contracts negotiated.

Table 6

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Audio-Visual Materials

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.1980	.756	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	124	.2619		Secondary	
Total	126			Importance	1
				No Importance	39
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.9167	.4396	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.9750	.4797		
Group 3	51	1.8431	.5787	2.975	.158
Total	127	1.9055			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

Table 7 shows the data obtained with regard to Citizenship Training. The ratings of the leadership groups did not differ significantly on the importance of this component in negotiations. School curriculum specialists rated Citizenship Training as being more important than the other

two groups rated it. Professors of curriculum rated this component as being less important than did the other two groups. In the contract analysis, this component did not appear in any of the contracts studied. It is apparently of no concern in the contracts negotiated. There would seem to be a discrepancy in the perceived importance of Citizenship Training and the actual inclusion in the contracts of this component.

Table 7

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Citizenship Training

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.3291	.749	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	122	.4395		Secondary	
Total	124			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.6944	.5767	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.7250	.6789		
Group 3	49	1.8571	.7071	3.000	0
Total	125	1.7680			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The data concerning the curriculum-instruction component of Class Interruptions are shown in Table 8. The leadership ratings of this component did not differ significantly. It is viewed as important in negotiations. It appeared in about half of the contracts studied. It was of Primary Importance in 5 contracts and of Secondary Importance in 12 contracts. Class Interruptions did not appear in 23 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 8

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Class Interruptions

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.9892	2.199	Primary Importance	5
Within Groups	122	.4498		Secondary	
Total	124			Importance	12
				No Importance	23
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.9722	.7362	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	39	1.7179	.6863		
Group 3	50	2.0000	.6061	2.450	.714
Total	125	1.9040			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

Table 9 shows the data obtained regarding Class Size. The leadership differed in their perception of the importance of this component in negotiations. The level of statistical significance for this variance is .0001. Class Size did not appear in any of the contracts analyzed.

Table 9

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Class Size

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	5.3149	20.211*	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.2630		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.9722	.5599	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.2250	.4229		
Group 3	52	1.5385	.5409	3.000	0
Total	128	1.5625			

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The results of the least-significant difference test are shown in Table 10 for Class Size. Each leadership group differed significantly from the others in its rating of this curriculum-instruction component. The largest mean difference was between the school curriculum specialists and the presidents of the local teacher organizations. The level of significance is .0001.

Table 10
Class Size
Differences Between Means of Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.7472*	+.4337*
Group 2		-.3132*
*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data concerning Course Content are shown in Table 11. The leadership groups rated this component as very important in negotiations and did not differ significantly. In the contract analysis, Course Content appeared in 5 contracts as being of Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 35 contracts.

Table 11

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Course Content

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.1433	.514	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.2786		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	5
				No Importance	35
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.3611	.5426	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.3250	.5256		
Group 3	52	1.2500	.5192	2.875	.335
Total	128	1.3047			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 12 shows the data relating to Curriculum Change Procedures. The leadership ratings differed significantly ($p < .01$) on the importance of this component in negotiations. The leadership rated this component as very important. In the contracts studied, Curriculum Change Procedures, appeared in 7 contracts. It appeared as a subpart of a section or provision (Secondary Importance). It did not

appear in 33 contracts.

Table 12
ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Curriculum Change Procedures

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.7517	5.096***	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3437		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	7
				No Importance	33
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.5556	.6522	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.5000	.6405		
Group 3	52	1.1923	.4866	2.825	.385
Total	128	1.3906			

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 13 shows the results of the least-significant test. Group 3, professors of curriculum, differed significantly in their ratings of Curriculum Change Procedures ($p < .01$) from the other two leadership groups. The largest mean difference was between Group 3, professors of curriculum,

and Group 1, school curriculum specialists. Group 3, professors of curriculum, viewed this component as more important in negotiations than did the other two groups.

Table 13

Curriculum Change Procedures
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.0556	+.3633***
Group 2		+.3077***
***Significant at the $p < .01$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data obtained regarding Curriculum Committees are shown in Table 14. This component was rated as important by the leadership with no significant difference in the analysis of variance. Curriculum Committees appeared in two of the contracts studied as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 38 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 14

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Curriculum Committees

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.7576	2.418	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3133		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	2
				No Importance	38
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.4722	.5599	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.7500	.5883		
Group 3	52	1.5769	.5367	2.950	.221
Total	128	1.6016			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 15 shows the data obtained concerning Curriculum Guides. The leadership rated this component as being relatively important in negotiations. There was no significant difference in the ratings. Curriculum Guides did not appear in any of the contracts studied.

Table 15

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Curriculum Guides

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.6654	1.802	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3693		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.6111	.6449	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.8750	.5158		
Group 3	52	1.7692	.6452	3.00	0
Total	128	1.7578			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The data relating to Equipment and Supplies Availability are shown in Table 16. Each leadership group rated this component as important with no significant difference between groups. The presidents of local teacher organizations (Group 2) rated this component as somewhat more important than did the other two groups. In the data obtained through contract analysis, Equipment and Supplies

Availability appeared in 12 contracts. It appeared in 3 as being of Primary Importance and in 9 as being of Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 28 of the contracts studied.

Table 16

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Equipment and Supplies Availability

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.6066	1.897	Primary Importance	3
Within Groups	125	.3197		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	9
				No Importance	28
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.7778	.4847	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.5250	.6400		
Group 3	52	1.6538	.5561	2.625	.628
Total	128	1.6484			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The data obtained relating to Facilities Available for Instruction are shown in Table 17. The three leadership groups differ significantly ($p < .01$) in their ratings of

this component in negotiations. All three groups rated it as being relatively important. In the contract analysis data, this component appeared in 8 contracts. Facilities Available for Instruction appeared as Primary Importance in 5 contracts. It appeared as Secondary Importance in 3 contracts. It did not appear in 32 of the contracts.

Table 17

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Facilities Available for Instruction

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.7225	4.887***	Primary Importance	5
Within Groups	125	.3524		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	3
				No Importance	32
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.7222	.6146	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.3250	.5723		
Group 3	52	1.6346	.5950	2.675	.694
Total	128	1.5625			

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The results of the least-significant difference test for Facilities Available for Instruction are shown in Table 18. The ratings of presidents of local teacher organizations (Group 2) differed significantly from the ratings of the other two groups. The level of significance for this variance is .01. Group 2 rated this component as being more important than did Group 1 and Group 3. The largest mean difference was between Groups 1 and 2.

Table 18

Facilities Available for Instruction
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.3972***	+.0876
Group 2		-.3096***

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Table 19 shows the data concerning Faculty Meetings. The leadership rated this as being important in negotiations. There was no significant difference between groups in the analysis of variance. Group 1, school curriculum specialists, rated this component as being more important

than did Group 2, presidents of local teacher organizations, and Group 3, professors of curriculum. Faculty Meetings appeared in more than half of the contracts studied. It appeared in 14 as Primary Importance and in 8 as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 18 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 19

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Faculty Meetings

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F	Count	
Between Groups	2	.0775	.232	Primary Importance	14
Within Groups	122	.3335		Secondary Importance	8
Total	124			No Importance	18
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	35	1.8571	.5500	2.100	.900
Group 2	39	1.9487	.5595		
Group 3	51	1.9020	.6084		
Total	125	1.9040			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The data relating to Faculty Planning Groups are shown in Table 20. The leadership rated this component as important. The analysis of variance found a significant difference in the leadership ratings ($p < .05$) of Faculty Planning Groups. In the contract analysis, this component did not appear in any of the contracts studied.

Table 20

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Faculty Planning Groups

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.3385	3.691****	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3626		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.6667	.5345	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.8000	.6869		
Group 3	52	1.4615	.5760	3.000	0
Total	128	1.6250			

****Significant at the $p < .05$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 21 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Faculty Planning Groups. Each of the leadership groups rated this component significantly different from the other two groups. The level of significance was .05. The largest mean difference was between the presidents of the local teacher organizations (Group 2) and the professors of curriculum (Group 3).

Table 21

Faculty Planning Groups
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	-.1333****	+.2052****
Group 2		+.3385****
****Significant at the $p < .05$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data obtained regarding Grouping of Learners are shown in Table 22. This component was rated as important by the leadership. A significant difference ($p < .05$) was found between groups. Grouping of Learners was found in 1 of the contracts studied. It appeared as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 39 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 22

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Grouping of Learners

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.6560	4.019****	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	123	.4121		Secondary	
Total	125			Importance	1
				No Importance	39
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	35	1.8857	.6311		
Group 2	40	1.7000	.7232		
Group 3	51	1.4902	.5787	2.975	.158
Total	126	1.6667			

****Significant at the $p < .05$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The least-significant difference test results for Grouping of Learners are shown in Table 23. Each leadership group differed significantly from the others in its rating of this curriculum-instruction component. The level of significance is .05. The largest mean difference was between school curriculum specialists (Group 1) and professors

of curriculum (Group 3).

Table 23

Grouping of Learners
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.1857****	+.3955****
Group 2		+.2098****
****Significant at the $p < .05$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Table 24 shows the data concerning Instructional Materials. This component was rated as relatively important by the leadership. There was no significant difference found between the rating groups. In the contract analysis, Instructional Materials appeared in 4 contracts as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 36 contracts.

Table 24

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Instructional Materials

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.3654	1.057	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	124	.3456		Secondary	
Total	126			Importance	4
				No Importance	36
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.5833	.6036	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.4000	.5905		
Group 3	51	1.4314	.5746	2.9000	.304
Total	127	1.4646			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The data obtained regarding Material Centers are shown in Table 25. It was rated as important in negotiations by all three leadership groups. Material Centers was not found in any of the contracts analyzed. Group 2, presidents of local teacher organizations, rated this component as somewhat less important than did the other two groups.

Table 25

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Material Centers

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.0242	.065	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3734		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.7778	.5909	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.8250	.6360		
Group 3	52	1.7885	.6051	3.000	0
Total	128	1.7969			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The data relating to Methodology are shown in Table 26. This component was rated as relatively important by the three leadership groups. The analysis of variance found a significant difference between the rating groups ($p < .001$). Methodology appeared in 2 contracts as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in the remaining 38 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 26

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Methodology

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	2.6317	7.690**	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	124	.3422		Secondary	
Total	126			Importance	2
				No Importance	38
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	1.6389	.6393		
Group 2	40	1.7250	.5986		
Group 3	51	1.2745	.5321	2.950	.221
Total	127	1.5197			

**Significant at the $p < .001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The results of the least-significant difference test are shown in Table 27 for the curriculum-instruction component of Methodology. The ratings of Group 3, professors of curriculum, differed significantly ($p < .001$) from the ratings of both Group 1, school curriculum specialists, and Group 2, presidents of local teacher organizations. The

professors rated Methodology as significantly more important than did the other leadership. The largest mean difference was between the professors and the presidents.

Table 27

Methodology
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	-.0861	+.3644**
Group 2		+.4505**

**Significant at the $p < .001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Table 28 shows the data concerning Parent Conferences. Parent Conferences was rated as relatively important in negotiations by the three leadership groups. No significant difference was found in the analysis of variance. School curriculum specialists (Group 1) rated this component as somewhat more important than did the other two groups. In the contract analysis, Parent Conferences was found in 8 contracts. It appeared as Primary Importance in 3 contracts and Secondary Importance in 5 contracts. It did not appear in 32 of the contracts.

Table 28

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Parent Conferences

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.7223	2.051	Primary Importance	3
Within Groups	125	.3522		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	5
				No Importance	32
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	1.4722	.5063		
Group 2	40	1.7250	.6400		
Group 3	52	1.6923	.6116	2.725	.599
Total	128	1.6406			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The data obtained regarding Professional Meeting Released Time are shown in Table 29. The leadership groups rated this component as important. A significant difference ($p < .01$) was found between the rating groups. In the contracts studied, Professional Meeting Released Time appeared in 36 contracts as Primary Importance. It did not appear in 4 of the contracts that were analyzed. This component

appears to be very important in actual practice.

Table 29

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Professional Meeting Released Time

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	2.3590	6.442***	Primary Importance	36
Within Groups	125	.3662		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	4
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	2.0278	.6088	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.7250	.5541		
Group 3	52	1.5577	.6390	1.2000	.608
Total	128	1.7422			

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 30 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Professional Meeting Released Time. Group 1, school curriculum specialists, differed significantly from the other leadership groups in its rating of the importance of Professional Meeting Released Time. The level

of this significance is .01. The largest mean difference was between the school curriculum specialists (Group 1) and professors of curriculum (Group 3). This finding seems to indicate that Professional Meeting Released Time was viewed as being very important both in theory and in practice.

Table 30

Professional Meeting Released Time
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.3028***	+.4701***
Group 2		+.1673
***Significant at the $p < .01$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data concerning Program Development Procedures are shown in Table 31. This component was rated as relatively important by each leadership group. The analysis of variance found a significant difference between the rating groups at the level of .0001. In the contract analysis data, Program Development Procedures appeared in 9 contracts. It appeared in 5 as Primary Importance and in 4 as Secondary

Importance. It did not appear in 31 of the contracts studied.

Table 31

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Program Development Procedures

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	2.9286	10.188*	Primary Importance	5
Within Groups	123	.2875		Secondary	
Total	125			Importance	4
				No Importance	31
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	35	1.6857	.5827	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.5750	.5943		
Group 3	51	1.1961	.4481	2.650	.700
Total	126	1.4524			

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 32 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Program Development Procedures. Group 3, professors of curriculum, differed significantly ($p < .0001$) from each of the other groups in its rating of

this component. The ratings of the professors were significantly more important than the ratings of the school curriculum specialists and the presidents of the local teacher organizations. The largest mean difference was between the professors and the curriculum specialists, Group 3 and Group 1.

Table 32

Program Development Procedures
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.1107	+.4896*
Group 2		+.3789*

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data regarding Pupil-Teacher Ratio are shown in Table 33. This component was rated as relatively important by the leadership. A significant difference ($p < .0001$) was found between the rating groups. In the contract analysis data, Pupil-Teacher Ratio was not found in any of the contracts studied.

Table 33

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	4.6742	18.333*	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.2550		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.9722	.5599	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.2750	.4522		
Group 3	52	1.5385	.5034	3.000	0
Total	128	1.5781			

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 34 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Pupil-Teacher Ratio. The results found each leadership group equally significantly different from each other at the .0001 level. The largest mean difference was between school curriculum specialists (Group 1) and presidents of local teacher organizations (Group 2).

Table 34
Pupil-Teacher Ratio
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.6972*	+.4337*
Group 2		-.2635*

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data obtained relating to Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work are shown in Table 35. The leadership rated this component as important (closer to Secondary than Primary) in negotiations. The analysis of variance found a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the rating groups. Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work was not found in any of the contracts analyzed.

Table 35

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Reimbursement of Teachers
for Course Work

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.3810	3.403****	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	121	.4059		Secondary	
Total	123			Importance	0
				No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	2.2500	.6492	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	39	1.8718	.6951		
Group 3	49	2.0000	.5774	3.000	0
Total	124	2.0323			

****Significant at the $p < .05$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The results of the least-significant difference test for Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work are shown in Table 36. Presidents of local teacher organizations rated this component as more important than the other two groups. The largest mean difference was between the presidents (Group 2) and the school curriculum specialists (Group 1).

The rating of each group was significantly different than the rating of each of the other groups at the .05 level.

Table 36

Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.3782****	+.2500****
Group 2		-.1282****
****Significant at the $p < .05$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Table 37 shows the data concerning Resource Persons from Outside the School. The leadership rated this component as important. Group 3, professors of curriculum, rated it as somewhat more important than did Group 1 and Group 2. A significant difference ($p < .01$) was found between the rating groups. In the contract analysis, Resource Persons from Outside the School was found in 1 contract. It appeared as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 39 contracts.

Table 37

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Resource Persons from Outside the School

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.8096	5.005***	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	124	.3616		Secondary	
Total	126			Importance	1
				No Importance	39
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	1.8611	.5426		
Group 2	40	2.1250	.5158		
Group 3	51	1.7255	.6951	2.975	.158
Total	127	1.8898			

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 38 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Resource Persons from Outside the School. Each group was equally significantly different ($p < .01$) from each of the others on the rating of the importance of this component.

Table 38

Resource Persons from Outside the School
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	-.2639***	+.1356***
Group 2		+.3995***
***Significant at the $p < .01$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data obtained regarding Sabbatical Leave are shown in Table 39. The leadership rated this component as important (closer to Secondary than to Primary) in negotiations. The analysis of variance found a significant difference between the ratings of the leadership groups. The level of significance is .0001. In the contract analysis, Sabbatical Leave appeared in 5 contracts as Primary Importance. It did not appear in 35 of the contracts studied.

Table 39

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Sabbatical Leave

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	7.1972	17.394*	Primary Importance	5
Within Groups	125	.4138		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	0
				No Importance	35
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	2.6389	.5426		
Group 2	40	2.2750	.7157		
Group 3	52	1.8269	.6484	2.750	.670
Total	128	2.1953			

*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

Table 40 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Sabbatical Leave. Each group rated Sabbatical Leave equally significantly different ($p < .0001$) from each of the others. The largest mean difference was between Group 3, professors of curriculum, and Group 1, school curriculum specialists. The professors rated

sabbatical Leave as significantly more important than the other groups rated it.

Table 40

Sabbatical Leave
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.3639*	+.8120*
Group 2		+.4481*
*Significant at the $p < .0001$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data regarding School-Community Relationship are shown in Table 41. The leadership groups rated this component as relatively important in negotiations. There was no significant difference in the rating groups. This component was found in 2 contracts as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 38 of the contracts studied.

Table 41

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for School-Community Relationship

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.1596	.374	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.4264		Secondary	
Total	127			Importance	2
				No Importance	38
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.5000	.6094	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.6250	.6279		
Group 3	52	1.5385	.6991	2.950	.221
Total	128	1.5547			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The data concerning School Organization are shown in Table 42. This component was rated as important by the leadership. Professors of curriculum (Group 3) rated School Organization as somewhat more important than did the other two groups. School curriculum specialists (Group 1) rated it as somewhat less important than did the other two groups. No significant difference was found. School Organization

appeared in 1 contract as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 39 of the contracts analyzed.

Table 42

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for School Organization

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.2349	.521	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	124	.4513		Secondary	
Total	126			Importance	1
				No Importance	39
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.8333	.6969	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.7250	.6789		
Group 3	51	1.6863	.6478	2.975	.158
Total	127	1.7402			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The data relating to Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum are shown in Table 43. This component was rated as relatively important by the three leadership groups. The analysis of variance found no significant difference. School curriculum specialists, Group 1, rated this component as

somewhat more important than the presidents or the professors rated it. In the contract analysis, Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum appeared in 3 contracts as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 37 of the contracts studied.

Table 43

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.1076	.345	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3120		Secondary Importance	3
Total	127			No Importance	37
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	1.3611	.5426		
Group 2	40	1.4250	.5495		
Group 3	52	1.4615	.5760	2.925	.267
Total	128	1.4219			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

The data obtained concerning Teacher Participation in Decision-Making are shown in Table 44. The leadership rated

this component as relatively important. The analysis of variance found a significant difference ($p < .01$) between the rating groups. This component, Teacher Participation in Decision-Making, appeared in about three quarters of the contracts analyzed. It appeared in 16 contracts as Primary Importance and in 12 as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 12 of the contracts studied.

Table 44

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Teacher Participation in
Decision-Making

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F	Count	
Between Groups	2	1.1562	5.016***	Primary Importance	16
Within Groups	124	.2305		Secondary Importance	12
Total	126			No Importance	12
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	35	1.4857	.5621	1.900	.841
Group 2	40	1.2000	.4641		
Group 3	52	1.1731	.4303		
Total	127	1.2677			

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

Table 45 shows the results of the least-significant difference test for Teacher Participation in Decision-Making. Both Group 2, presidents of local teacher organizations, and Group 3, professors of curriculum, differed significantly ($p < .01$) from Group 1, school curriculum specialists. The largest mean difference was between Group 3 and Group 1.

Table 45

Teacher Participation in Decision-Making
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.2857***	+.3126***
Group 2		+.0269
***Significant at the $p < .01$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Table 46 shows the data regarding Teacher's Responsibilities in Classroom Activities. This component was considered very important as indicated by the leadership ratings. No significant difference was found between the groups. This component appeared in 9 of the contracts studied. It appeared in 3 as Primary Importance and in 6 as

Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 31 of the contracts.

Table 46

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Teacher's Responsibilities in
Classroom Activities

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.0522	.293	Primary Importance	3
Within Groups	124	.1778		Secondary	
Total	126			Importance	6
				No Importance	31
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.1944	.4672	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.1250	.4043		
Group 3	51	1.1373	.4010	2.700	.608
Total	127	1.1496			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The data concerning Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth are shown in Table 47. The leadership rated this component as relatively important. The analysis of variance found no significant difference between groups.

Professors of curriculum, Group 3, rated this component as somewhat more important than did the other two groups. Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth appeared in about half of the contracts analyzed. It appeared in 9 contracts as Primary Importance and in 9 contracts as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 22. These findings indicate that this component is important from both the points of view expressed by leadership and in actual practice.

Table 47

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts Analyzed for Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	.5110	1.559	Primary Importance	9
Within Groups	125	.3278		Secondary Importance	9
Total	127			No Importance	22
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	1.4722	.6540	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	40	1.4250	.5006		
Group 3	52	1.2692	.5641	2.325	.829
Total	128	1.3750			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

Table 48 shows the data obtained relating to the required use of Textbook. This component was rated as important in negotiations by the three groups. A significant difference ($p < .01$) was found in the rating groups. Textbook (required use) did not appear in any of the contracts analyzed.

Table 48

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Textbook (required use)

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F		Count
Between Groups	2	1.7828	5.402***	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	123	.3300		Secondary Importance	0
Total	125			No Importance	40
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Group 1	36	2.0833	.4392	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 2	39	1.6667	.6213		
Group 3	51	1.7647	.6193	3.000	0
Total	126	1.8254			

***Significant at the $p < .01$ level

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1
Secondary Importance=2
No Importance=3

The least-significant difference test results for Textbook (required use) are shown in Table 49. Both Group 2, presidents of local teacher organizations, and Group 3, professors of curriculum, differed significantly in the rating of this component from Group 1, school curriculum specialists. The level of significance is .01. The largest mean difference was between school curriculum specialists, Group 1, and professors of curriculum, Group 3.

Table 49

Textbook (required use)
Differences Between Means for Pairs of Groups
(Row Minus Columns)

Mean Difference		
	Group 2	Group 3
Group 1	+.4166***	+.3186***
Group 2		-.0980
***Significant at the $p < .01$ level		

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

The data regarding Textbook Selection are shown in Table 50. The leadership rated this component as important in negotiations. No significant difference was found for the rating groups. In the contract analysis, Textbook

Selection was found in 3 contracts. It appeared as Secondary Importance. It did not appear in 37 of the contracts studied.

Table 50

ANOVA for Rating Groups and Incidence in Contracts
Analyzed for Textbook Selection

Analysis of Variance				Contract Analysis	
Source	d.f.	M.S.	F	Count	
Between Groups	2	.4279	1.240	Primary Importance	0
Within Groups	125	.3451		Secondary Importance	3
Total	127			No Importance	37
				Total	40
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Group 1	36	1.6111	.6449		
Group 2	40	1.4000	.5454		
Group 3	52	1.4808	.5770	2.925	.267
Total	128	1.4922			

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists

Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations

Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Ratings

Primary Importance=1

Secondary Importance=2

No Importance=3

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this section is to present the findings and to interpret the findings in an attempt to answer the research questions of this study. These questions are

1. With what frequency do the identified curriculum-instruction components appear in the contracts?
2. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by the school district curriculum specialists?
3. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by the elected presidents of the local teacher organizations?
4. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by college and university professors expert in curriculum matters?
5. What are the differences or similarities in ratings of the identified curriculum-instruction components as indicated by the leadership ratings of elected presidents of the local teacher organizations, public school curriculum specialists, and professors expert in curriculum matters?

In an attempt to answer question one, the findings of the contract analysis data were the following:

1. Twenty-six of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared in the contracts as either of Primary Importance or of Secondary Importance or of both. Table 51 shows a summary of the Contract Analysis data.
2. Eight of the identified curriculum-instruction components did not appear in any of the contracts studied. The components that did not appear are (1) Citizenship Training, (2) Class Size, (3) Curriculum Guides, (4) Faculty Planning Groups, (5) Material Centers, (6) Pupil-Teacher Ratio, (7) Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work, and (8) Textbook (required use). These are shown in Table 51. These items were not of contractual concern.
3. Four of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared exclusively as Primary Importance. These are (1) Academic Freedom, (2) Advanced Study Credit for Teachers, (3) Professional Meeting Released Time, and (4) Sabbatical Leave. It would seem that when each of these items is considered of contractual concern that it is viewed as being very important. Advanced Study Credit for Teachers appeared in each of the contracts analyzed.

Table 51

Contract Analysis Summary of Total Sample

Curriculum-Instruction Component	Contract Appearance		
	P	S	N
Academic Freedom	2	0	38
Advanced Study Credit for Teachers	40	0	0
Aims of Schools	0	3	37
Audio-Visual Materials	0	1	39
Citizenship Training	0	0	40
Class Interruptions	5	12	23
Class Size	0	0	40
Course Content	0	5	35
Curriculum Change Procedures	0	7	33
Curriculum Committees	0	2	38
Curriculum Guides	0	0	40
Equipment and Supplies Availability	3	9	28
Facilities Available for Instruction	5	3	32
Faculty Meetings	14	8	18
Faculty Planning Groups	0	0	40
Grouping of Learners	0	1	39
Instructional Materials	0	4	36
Material Centers	0	0	40
Methodology	0	2	38
Parent Conferences	3	5	32
Professional Meeting Released Time	36	0	4
Program Development Procedures	5	4	31
Pupil-Teacher Ratio	0	0	40
Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work	0	0	40
Resource Persons from Outside the School	0	1	39
Sabbatical Leave	5	0	35
School-Community Relationship	0	2	38
School Organization	0	1	39
Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum	0	3	37
Teacher Participation in Decision-Making	16	12	12
Teacher's Responsibilities in Classroom Activities	3	6	31
Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth	9	9	22
Textbook (required use)	0	0	40
Textbook Selection	0	3	37

Key to Contract Appearance

P=Primary Importance

S=Secondary Importance

N=Component did not appear in contract

Total Sample=40 contracts

4. Nine of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared as either Primary Importance or Secondary Importance in at least one contract. These are (1) Class Interruptions, (2) Equipment and Supplies Availability, (3) Facilities Available for Instruction, (4) Faculty Meetings, (5) Parent Conferences, (6) Program Development Procedures, (7) Teacher Participation in Decision-Making, (8) Teacher's Responsibilities in Classroom Activities, and (9) Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth. When each of these items is of contractual concern, it is considered as being either Primary or Secondary Importance.
5. Thirteen of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared exclusively as Secondary Importance. These are (1) Aims of Schools, (2) Audio-Visual Materials, (3) Course Content, (4) Curriculum Change Procedures, (5) Curriculum Committees, (6) Grouping of Learners, (7) Instructional Materials, (8) Methodology, (9) Resource Persons from Outside the School, (10) School-Community Relationship, (11) School Organization, (12) Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum, and (13) Textbook Selection. These items would seem to be important (Secondary) but not as important as some other curriculum-instruction items.

These findings as shown in Table 51 indicate the actual appearance of the components in the contracts analyzed. The count (frequency) with which each component appeared was also shown in the tables in Section 1 with the ANOVA data.

In an attempt to answer questions two, three, four, and five, the findings of the analysis of variance and the least-significant test data were the following:

1. Each leadership group rated each of the identified curriculum-instruction components as important in negotiations. The means of the groups rarely exceeded 2.0 and were usually within the range of 1.8 to 1.2. These data were shown in the tables in Section 1.
2. There was general agreement (not statistically significantly different) on the relative importance of nineteen of the identified curriculum-instruction components by the leadership. These are (1) Advanced Study Credit for Teachers, (2) Aims of Schools, (3) Audio-Visual Materials, (4) Citizenship Training, (5) Class Interruptions, (6) Course Content, (7) Curriculum Committees, (8) Curriculum Guides, (9) Equipment and Supplies Availability, (10) Faculty Meetings, (11) Instructional Materials, (12) Material Centers, (13) Parent Conferences, (14) School-Community Relationship, (15) School Organization,

(16) Scope and Sequence in the Curriculum, (17) Teacher's Responsibilities in Classroom Activities, (18) Teacher Responsibility for Professional Growth, and (19) Textbook Selection. These data are shown in the tables in Section 1.

3. Statistically significant differences were found between the means across the three leadership groups in the ratings of fifteen of the identified curriculum instruction components. The results of the least-significant difference test for each of these components are shown in the tables in Section 1. A summary of the data is shown in Table 52.
4. The ANOVA found the highest level of significant difference at .0001 (largest variance) between groups for five of the curriculum-instruction components. These are (1) Academic Freedom, (2) Class Size, (3) Program Development Procedures, (4) Pupil-Teacher Ratio, and (5) Sabbatical Leave. Each of the three leadership groups differed from each of the others on the ratings of (1) Class Size, (2) Pupil-Teacher Ratio, and (3) Sabbatical Leave. For Academic Freedom, the ratings of both Group 2 (presidents) and Group 3 (professors) differed significantly from Group 1 (school curriculum specialists). For Program Development Procedures, the ratings of Group 3 (professors) differed significantly

Table 52

Summary of ANOVA for Rating Groups with
Significant Differences

Curriculum-Instruction Component	F	Rating Groups
Academic Freedom	*	Group 2, Group 3
Class Size	*	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Curriculum Change Procedures	***	Group 3
Facilities Available for Instruction	***	Group 2
Faculty Planning Groups	****	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Grouping of Learners	****	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Methodology	**	Group 3
Professional Meeting Released Time	***	Group 1
Program Development Procedures	*	Group 3
Pupil-Teacher Ratio	*	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work	****	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Resource Persons from Outside the School	***	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Sabbatical Leave	*	Group 1, Group 2, Group 3
Teacher Participation in Decision-Making	***	Group 2, Group 3
Textbook (required use)	***	Group 2, Group 3

Key to Groups

Group 1=School Curriculum Specialists
Group 2=Presidents of Local Teacher Organizations
Group 3=Professors of Curriculum

Key to Significance Levels

*=p < .0001
**=p < .001
***=p < .01
****=p < .05

from the ratings of the other two groups.

5. Methodology obtained the next level of significance ($p < .001$) between the rating groups. Group 3 (professors) differed significantly from the other two groups in its rating of this component.
6. Six items had ratings which differed significantly between groups at the .01 level. These are (1) Curriculum Change Procedures, (2) Facilities Available for Instruction, (3) Professional Meeting Released Time, (4) Resource Persons from Outside the School, (5) Teacher Participation in Decision-Making, and (6) Textbook (required use). For Curriculum Change Procedures, Group 3 (professors) differed from the other two groups. For Facilities Available for Instruction, Group 2 (presidents) differed from the other two groups. For Professional Meeting Released Time, Group 1 (school curriculum specialists) differed from the other two groups. For Resource Persons from Outside the School, each of the groups differed from each of the others on the rating of this item. For Teacher Participation in Decision-Making, both Group 2 (presidents) and Group 3 (professors) differed from Group 1 (school curriculum specialists) on the rating of this item. For Textbook (required use), the ratings of both Group 2 (presidents) and Group 3 (professors) differed

from Group 1 (school curriculum specialists).

7. Three items obtained a significant difference level of .05 for the ratings groups. These are (1) Faculty Planning Groups, (2) Grouping of Learners, and (3) Reimbursement of Teachers for Course Work. Each of the groups differed from each of the other groups on the rating of each of the three curriculum-instruction components. These data are shown in Table 52.

SUMMARY

This chapter reported the data obtained in the study and described the findings related to the research questions posed by this investigation. The data were reported in Section 1 in the following manner:

1. The ratings of each leadership group with the results of the contract analysis were shown in a separate table for each of the identified curriculum-instruction components.

2. When the F value of the ANOVA was significant (alpha level .05), the differences between means for pairs of groups of the ratings of the component were shown in a separate table following the presentation of the ANOVA data.

The data were presented in Tables 2 through 50 in Section 1. The findings related to the research questions

were presented in Section 2 of this chapter. Two tables (Table 51 and Table 52) were used to summarize and organize the findings.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, OBSERVATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The problem of this study was to determine the frequency with which curriculum and instruction-related concerns are evident in collective negotiations in Iowa and how important these concerns are as perceived by the educational leadership. The sources of data were the statements or points of view expressed by persons in positions of leadership and an analysis of actual practice. The questions posed by this investigation were:

1. With what frequency do the identified curriculum-instruction components appear in the contracts?
2. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by the school district curriculum specialists?
3. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by the elected presidents of the local teacher organizations?
4. What is the importance ascribed to the negotiation of the identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by college and university professors expert in curriculum matters?

5. What are the differences or similarities in the ratings of the identified curriculum-instruction components as indicated by the leadership ratings of the public school curriculum specialists, the elected presidents of the local teacher organizations, and the professors expert in curriculum matters?

A review of the literature revealed that collective negotiations can be viewed either as a threat to existing powers or as an affirmative development in the professionalization of teachers. Writers have questioned whether or not an adversarial approach, encouraged through the process of collective negotiations, is a viable process of decision-making about curriculum and instructional matters. The question of what should be legitimately negotiated continues to be discussed in the literature. The leaders of teachers' organizations and some other educational leaders view curriculum and instruction-related items as negotiable. Another point of view, generally expressed by school board members and some administrators, is that these matters are not negotiable. The majority opinion expressed in the literature indicated that the issue should be focused on negotiating procedures related to curricular and instructional concerns and not on substance. The review of research related to the actual content of negotiated agreements revealed that provisions in the contracts contained both

process and substance components. The contract analysis research revealed a trend toward the negotiation of components related to process rather than components related to substance. A brief summary of the findings of this study is separated into those related to contract analysis and those related to the ratings of the educational leadership.

The findings related to contract analysis show that (1) twenty-six of the thirty-four identified curriculum-instruction components appeared in the contracts as either of Primary Importance or of Secondary Importance or of both; (2) eight of the identified curriculum-instruction components did not appear in any of the contracts analyzed; (3) four of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared exclusively as Primary Importance; (4) nine of the identified curriculum-instruction components had ratings in both Primary and Secondary categories since they appeared in at least one contract as either Primary or Secondary Importance; and (5) thirteen of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared exclusively as Secondary Importance.

The findings related to the points of view of the educational leadership are that (1) each leadership group rated each of the identified curriculum-instruction components as important in negotiations; (2) there was general agreement (with no significant differences) on the relative

importance of nineteen of the identified curriculum-instruction components; (3) statistically significant differences were found between the means across the three leadership groups in the ratings of fifteen of the identified curriculum-instruction components; (4) ANOVA found the highest level of significant difference at .0001 between groups for five of the fifteen; (5) one component obtained a level of significant difference of .001; (6) six components had ratings which differed significantly at the .01 level; and (7) three components obtained a significant difference level of .05 for the rating groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the limitations of this study and based on the findings obtained from contract analysis, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. The results of the analysis indicate that curriculum-instruction components have been negotiated and are of contractual concern.
2. Approximately three-quarters (26) of the identified curriculum-instruction components appeared in at least one contract.
3. A large majority of the negotiated components did not appear in more than one-quarter (10) of the total contracts analyzed for this study.

4. The negotiated components appeared more frequently in the Secondary Importance category than in the Primary Importance category.
5. Approximately one-quarter (8) of the identified curriculum-instruction components did not appear in any provision of any contract and are not of contractual concern in this particular instance.
6. The negotiated components tend to represent more concern with process related curriculum-instruction components than substance related curriculum-instruction components.

Within the limitations of this study and based on the results of the educational leadership ratings of the identified curriculum-instruction components, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Each of the identified curriculum-instruction components was perceived as important in negotiations by each of the leadership groups.
2. There was general agreement on the relative importance of nineteen of the thirty-four identified curriculum-instruction components as negotiable items by the leadership.
3. There was a significant difference in the ratings by the leadership of fifteen of the identified curriculum-instruction components on the degree of importance of these items in negotiations.

4. Fourteen of the fifteen components that obtained a level of significant difference in leadership ratings were process related rather than substance related components.
5. Group 1 (school curriculum specialists) differed significantly from the other leadership groups on the ratings of eight of the fifteen components.
6. Group 2 (presidents of the local teacher organizations) differed significantly from the other leadership groups on the ratings of eleven of the fifteen components.
7. Group 3 (professors of curriculum) differed significantly from the other leadership groups on the ratings of thirteen of the fifteen components.

In comparing the results of the perceived importance of the identified curriculum-instruction components as indicated by the ratings of the leadership groups with the contract analysis findings, another conclusion may be reached: there is a discrepancy between the perceived importance of the components as negotiable items and the components actually negotiated in the contracts.

OBSERVATIONS

It seems worthwhile to speculate on the reasons for the discrepancy between the perceived importance of the components as negotiable items and the lack of contractual

concern evidenced in the analysis. One possible explanation is that the components are non-mandatory subjects of bargaining by law.¹ The components might not have been high priority items for bargaining by either the leadership of the teachers' organizations or the leadership of the school boards. As Perry, Wildman and other researchers noted, "policy" issues such as those related to such matters as curriculum and instruction are the final set of issues after salary and working conditions to receive priority for negotiations.² Because the components may be considered as "other matters mutually agreed upon" and both the leadership of the teacher organizations and the school districts rated the components as important in negotiations, it might be expected that the components may represent concerns in future negotiations.³ Whether the representatives of the teacher organization and the school board will be able to agree on these as "other matters mutually agreed upon" is another question. Walton and McKersie suggested that qualitative, variable-sum problems such as those represented by the components lend themselves to the strategy of

¹Iowa, Iowa Code, Sec. 20, (1974).

²Charles R. Perry and Wesley Wildman, The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 109-136.

³Iowa, Iowa Code, Sec.20, (1974).

integrative bargaining. The function of this strategy is to find common or complementary interests and common solutions.¹ Solutions reached through integrative bargaining or through a "professional" model bargaining strategy could be more creative and beneficial to children than the solutions reached through the traditional labor-management adversarial approach.²

The unanimous response of the educational leadership to the components as being important in negotiations warrants discussion. One explanation is that the responses do reflect the opinion that these components are important in negotiations. Another possible explanation is that the respondents misunderstood the instructions for rating the components and rated each component in terms of its importance to the curriculum and instructional program of the school and not in terms of its importance in the context of negotiations. This latter explanation is less likely to be the case in relation to the leadership of the Iowa schools because of a high degree of interest in negotiations due to

¹Richard E. Walton and Robert B. McKersie, A Behavioral Theory of Labor Relations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965), Chapter 2 and Chapter 4.

²Bernard W. Kinsella and others, The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation, For the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Committee on the Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers, U.S., Educational Resources Informational Center, ERIC Document ED 035 080, 1969.

the implementation of state law. Both teacher organization and school district resources were involved in the process of negotiations. Since the professors of curriculum were from a nation-wide sample, they probably were not as aware of the situation in Iowa. However, the professors may have had experience with negotiations or an awareness of the issue elsewhere. Perhaps this lack of direct involvement in the issue in Iowa may help to explain why the responses of the professors varied significantly on the ratings of more components than those of the two other leadership groups.

The following inferences may be made from the results of the study:

1. The educational leadership, both in the public school sector (K-12) and at the university level, should be aware of the effects of collective negotiations on the curriculum-instruction of the schools.
2. Important skills that an educational leader might possess are those skills required in the process of collective negotiations and/or conflict resolution.
3. Curriculum specialists and others responsible for curriculum decision-making need to reassess their roles and the procedures they employ in decision-making to assure a viable role for professional judgment in the context of collective negotiations.

The writer questions whether the process of negotiations, as currently practiced, is a productive means of curriculum decision-making. Curricular decisions should be reached through a cooperative effort, utilizing professional judgment, based upon reasonable study and research. Another consideration is the emotional climate surrounding the negotiations process. The psychological barriers resulting from the negotiations process can be detrimental to interpersonal relationships. Decisions based upon the compromise of the labor-management bargaining process may not be in the best interests of the children in the schools. It is imperative that curricular workers develop roles and processes within the context of negotiations that will facilitate productive curriculum decision-making.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study suggest some other investigations which might be undertaken to increase the understanding of the issue of negotiations and curriculum-instruction. A follow-up study, using the same sample of school districts, could be made in three or four years to analyze the contracts to determine whether or not more or fewer of the identified curriculum-instruction components are negotiated. This same type of study could be undertaken to determine the points of view of the chief negotiators of the teacher organizations and the school districts. Another

study might involve the ratings of classroom teachers, using the same research instrument, and compare the ratings with those of the elected presidents of the teacher organizations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Ashby, Lloyd W., James E. McGinnis, and Thomas E. Persing. Common Sense in Negotiations in Public Education. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. 2d. ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1972.
- Broudy, Harry S. The Real World of the Public Schools. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.
- Della-Dora, Delmo, and James E. House, eds. Education for an Open Society. 1974 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974.
- Doll, Ronald C. Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Process. 2d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.
- Guilford, J. P., and Benjamin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Joyce, Bruce R. The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect. Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Kerney, Nolan C., and Walter W. Cook. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.
- Leighbody, Gerald B., and Ernest F. Weinrich. Balance in the Curriculum. 1961 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1961.
- Lieberman, Myron, and Michel H. Moskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

Macdonald, James B. Theories of Instruction. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.

_____, and Esther Zaret, eds. Schools in Search of Meaning. 1975 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

Miller, William C., and David N. Newbury. Teacher Negotiations: A Guide for Bargaining Teams. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1970.

Myers, Donald. Teacher Power-Professionalization and Collective Bargaining. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.

National Education Association. Addresses and Proceedings of the One-Hundredth Annual Meeting. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962.

_____. Addresses and Proceedings of the One-Hundred and Tenth Annual Meeting. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1972.

Nie, Norman H., and others. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Perry, Charles R., and Wesley Wildman. The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Smith, B. Othanel, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1957.

Stinnett, T. M., Jack Kleinmann, and Martha Ware. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1962.

Walter, Robert L. The Teacher and Collective Bargaining. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1975.

Walton, Richard E., and Robert B. McKersie. A Behavioral Theory of Labor Relations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965.

Wirt, Frederick M., ed. The Polity of the School: New Research in Educational Politics. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1975.

Wirt, Frederick M., and Michael W. Kirst. The Political Web of American Schools. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.

Wollet, Donald H., and Robert H. Chanin. The Law and Practice of Teacher Negotiations. Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1974.

Young, Oran R., ed. Bargaining: Formal Theories of Negotiation. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1975.

B. PERIODICALS

Alfonso, Robert J. "Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction," Negotiation Research Digest, II (May, 1969), E-1 to E-4.

Andrews, J. Edward, Jr. "What are the Issues?", Educational Leadership, XXVI (March, 1969), 535-38.

Bard, Bernard. "Albert Shanker: Portrait in Power," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (March, 1975), 466-72.

Bill of Teacher Rights, Today's Education, LXV (March/April, 1976), gate-fold cover.

Cheng, Charles W. "Community Representation in Teacher Collective Bargaining: Problems and Prospects," Harvard Educational Review, XLVI (May, 1976), 153-74.

"Collective-Bargaining Coverage by State," Compact, IX (February, 1975), 16.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Teacher Militancy in the United States: Reflections on Its Sources and Prospects," Teacher Power: Theory Into Practice, VII (April, 1968), 96-102.

Frymier, Jack R. "Teacher Power, Negotiations, and the Roads Ahead," Teacher Power: Theory Into Practice, VII (April, 1968), 103-104.

Giandomenico, Lawrence L. "Teacher Needs, Militancy, and the Scope of Collective Bargaining," The Journal of Educational Research, LXVI (February, 1973), 257-259.

- Hough, Wendell M., Jr. "A Better Curriculum Through Negotiation?", Educational Leadership, XXVI (March, 1969), 531-534.
- Iowa State Education Association, "Informational Report," Communique, XXXI (February, 1976), 7.
- Jones, Philip G. "Should the Public Join You and Your Teachers at the Bargaining Table?", The American School Board Journal, CLXII (September, 1975), 27-31.
- Kleinmann, Jack H. "Curriculum Negotiation: How? To What End?", Educational Leadership, XXIX (April, 1972), 573-75.
- Lieberman, Myron. "The Future of Collective Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (December, 1971), 214-16.
- Mannix, Thomas. "Labor Negotiations and Teacher Contract Bargaining, Parallels and Problems," Educational Leadership, XXXII, (April, 1975), 441-43.
- National Education Association, Research Division. "Curriculum Review in Negotiation Agreements," NEA Research Bulletin, XLVIII (December, 1970), 106-108.
- _____. "Negotiation Agreements: Qualifications for Professional Growth and In-service Training," Negotiation Research Digest, II (May, 1969), B-1 to B-11.
- _____. "Joint Committees Established in Comprehensive Classroom Teacher Agreements," Negotiation Research Digest, VI (September, 1972), 14-19.
- _____. "The Growth of Classroom Teacher Collective Bargaining: 1966-1971," Negotiation Research Digest, VI (October, 1972), 19.
- _____. "Trends in Negotiable Items for Teachers," Negotiation Research Digest, LVI (November, 1972), 13-15.
- Newland, Chester. "Collective Bargaining Concepts: Applications in Governments," Public Administration Review, XXVIII (March/April, 1968), 117-126.
- Nigro, Felix A. "The Implications for Public Administration," Public Administration Review, XXVIII (March/April, 1968) 137-47.

- Pope, Lawrence E. "Analysis of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act," Drake Law Review, XXIV (Fall, 1974), 1-51.
- Ryor, John. "This is the Election Year Teachers Have Been Waiting For," NEA Reporter, XV (April, 1976), 3.
- Selden, David. "How Fares Curriculum in Collective Bargaining?", Educational Leadership, XXXIII (October, 1975), 28-30.
- "Teacher's Instructional Problems, 1974," Today's Education, LXIII (September/October, 1974), 78-80.
- Webb, Harold V. "A New Gallup Study: What the Public Really Thinks of Its School Boards," The American School Board Journal, CLXII (April, 1975), 36-40, 58.
- Weinstock, Henry R., and Paul L. Van Horn. "Impact of Negotiations Upon Public Education," Clearing House, XLIII (February, 1969), 358-63.
- Weitzman, Joan. "A Review of Significant Public Sector Labor Relations Developments," CLM 25 Iowa: Iowa Public Employer-Employee Relations, I (Summer, 1975), 1-4.
- Young, William F. "Curriculum Negotiations: Present Status-Future Trends," Educational Leadership, XXVI (January, 1969), 341-43.
- _____. "Curriculum Negotiation: How? To What Extent?", Educational Leadership, XXIX (April, 1972), 576-78.
- Ziemer, Russell H., and A. Gray Thompson. "Negotiations and Curriculum: NEA vs AFT," Educational Leadership, XXXI (November, 1973), 102-104.

C. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

- Bishop, Leslee J. Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction: Questions and Concerns. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 017 072, 1967.
- Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics. Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Department of Public Instruction, Information Services.
Iowa Educational Directory, 1975-76 School Year.
 Des Moines, Iowa: Information Services, Department of
 Public Instruction, 1975.

Hottleman, Girard. Negotiating for Professionalization.
 National Teacher Education and Professional Standards
 Conference, National Education Association, Washington,
 D.C., June 24-27, 1969, U.S., Educational Resources
 Information Center, ERIC Document ED 044 367, 1970.

Howe, Jonathon T. Collective Bargaining: What's Negotiable.
 Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National
 School Boards Association, Miami Beach, April 19-22,
 1975, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center,
 ERIC Document ED 105 651, 1975.

Iannaccone, Laurence, and Peter J. Cistone. The Politics of
Education. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management, ERIC Document ED 091 803, 1974.

Iowa. Iowa Code. Section 20. (1974).

Kinsella, Bernard W., and others. The Supervisor's Role in
Negotiations, For the Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development Committee on the Problems of
Supervisors and Curriculum Workers, U.S., Educational
 Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 035 080,
 1969.

Lieberman, Myron. Neglected Issues in Federal Public
Employee Collective Bargaining Legislation. Paper
 presented at National Conference of State Legislators,
 Washington, D.C., March 20, 1975, U.S., Educational
 Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 105 615,
 1975.

Public Employment Relations Board [660], IAC, 7/1/75.

D. OTHER SOURCES

American Federation of Teachers. Goals of the American
Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, Number 16. Washington,
 D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, n.d.

Guthrie, James W., and Patricia A. Craig. Teachers and
Politics. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Edu-
 cational Foundation, 1973.

Iowa Association of School Boards. An Analysis of Teacher Contract Proposals. Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa Association of School Boards, 1975.

Iowa State Education Association. Employee Evaluation Guide. Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, August, 1975.

_____. ISEA Master Outline Working Paper for a Comprehensive Agreement. Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, n.d.

_____. Sample Contract Language for Areas Covered by IPD Committees. Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, n.d.

Ross, Doris. '76 Update: Collective Bargaining in Education, A Legislator's Guide. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, January, 1976.

E. UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Della-Dora, Delmo. "Democracy and Education: Who Owns the Curriculum?" Address at Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference, Miami Beach, Florida, March 13-17, 1976. Tape available from Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Frost, Donald R. A position paper presented at a General Assembly on Collective Bargaining, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference, March 15, 1976, Miami Beach, Florida. (Mimeographed)

Steele, Marilyn Harger. "Has Collective Bargaining Contributed to Instructional Improvement in Michigan Schools?" Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

Ziemer, Russell H. "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum-Instruction Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, 1972.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS

5820 Pleasant Drive
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
May 7, 1976

Because of your professional status, I am requesting your assistance in the collection of data for a doctoral dissertation at Drake University. Will you please select the school district employee who is most expert in curriculum matters to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope? It would be appreciated if it could be returned by May 21. The replies will be confidential and will not be associated with your school district.

This study deals with priority matters related to the Public Employment Relations Act. The results of the study should be helpful to the educational leadership of Iowa who make vital decisions concerning the quality of the educational programs of our schools. Wayne Lueders has expressed an interest in the results for the Iowa Association of School Boards. Thank you and your curriculum person for cooperation and assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

B. L. McCrady

Enclosures

1. questionnaire
2. stamped, self-addressed envelope

APPENDIX B

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER SENT TO ELECTED PRESIDENTS OF
TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS

5820 Pleasant Drive
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
May 7, 1976

Because of your professional status, I am requesting your assistance in the collection of data for a doctoral dissertation at Drake University. Could you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope? It would be appreciated if it could be returned by May 15. Your replies will be confidential and will not be associated with your local affiliate.

This study deals with priority matters related to the Public Employment Relations Act. The results should be helpful to the educational leadership of Iowa. Roy Shaw, Negotiations Specialist of the Iowa State Education Association, is interested in the results. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

B. L. McCrady

Enclosures

1. questionnaire
2. stamped, self-addressed envelope

APPENDIX C

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER SENT TO CURRICULUM PROFESSORS

5820 Pleasant Drive
Des Moines, IA 50312
May 7, 1976

Because of your professional status, I am requesting your assistance in the collection of data for a doctoral dissertation at Drake University in Curriculum and Instruction. Could you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope? Your replies will be confidential.

The study deals with priority matters important to the profession. The results should be helpful to those persons in leadership positions who make decisions related to the educational program. If you are interested in the results, please send me a postcard. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

B. L. McCrady

Enclosures

1. questionnaire
2. stamped, self-addressed envelope

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO EACH EDUCATIONAL LEADER

5820 Pleasant Drive
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
May 21, 1976

I sincerely hope that you will be able to assist in the collection of data for this study. Enclosed are another questionnaire and stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

B. L. McCrady

Enclosures

APPENDIX E

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Curriculum-Instruction Questionnaire

Job title: _____

Iowa state law details negotiable areas as wages, hours, vacations, insurance, job classifications, seniority, transfer procedures, holidays, leaves of absence, shift differentials, overtime compensation, supplemental pay, health and safety matters, evaluation procedures, in-service training, procedures for staff reduction, and other matters mutually agreed upon.

The items listed below may be considered important as "other matters mutually agreed upon" in negotiations. Please place a check on the appropriate line corresponding to your rating of each item in terms of its being of primary or secondary or of no importance to CURRICULUM-INSTRUCTION for elementary-secondary education in a public school setting.

Age⁷ 1. under 30 _____
 2. 30-40 _____
 3. 41-50 _____
 4. 51-60 _____
 5. over 60 _____

Sex⁶ 1. Male _____
 2. Female _____

	Primary 1	secondary 2	No importance 3		Primary 1	secondary 2	No importance 3
1. Academic freedom..... ⁸				20. Parent conferences..... ²¹			
2. Advanced study credit for teachers..... ⁹				21. Professional meeting released time..... ²²			
3. Aims of schools..... ¹⁰				22. Program development procedures..... ²³			
4. Audio-visual materials..... ¹¹				23. Pupil-teacher ratio..... ²⁴			
5. Citizenship training..... ¹²				24. Reimbursement of teachers for course work..... ²⁵			
6. Class interruptions..... ¹³				25. Resource persons from outside the school..... ²⁶			
7. Class size..... ¹⁴				26. Sabbatical leave..... ²⁷			
8. Course content..... ¹⁵				27. School-community relationship..... ²⁸			
9. Curriculum change procedures..... ¹⁶				28. School organization..... ²⁹			
10. Curriculum committees..... ¹⁷				29. Scope and sequence in the curriculum..... ³⁰			
11. Curriculum guides..... ¹⁸				30. Teacher participation in decision-making..... ³¹			
12. Equipment and supplies availability..... ¹⁹				31. Teacher's responsibilities in classroom activities..... ³²			
13. Facilities available for instruction..... ²⁰				32. Teacher responsibility for professional growth..... ³³			
14. Faculty meetings..... ²¹				33. Textbook (required use)..... ³⁴			
15. Faculty planning groups..... ²²				34. Textbook selection..... ³⁵			
16. Grouping of learners..... ²³							
17. Instructional materials..... ²⁴							
18. Material centers..... ²⁵							
19. Methodology..... ²⁶							